

The University of Chicago  
Libraries





BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE BACKGROUND OF THE GOSPELS ;  
or, Judaism in the Period between the  
Old and the New Testaments.

*Demy 8vo. Fourth Edition. 12s. net.*

JESUS AND THE GREEKS. Early  
Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism.

*Demy 8vo. 12s. net.*

ORIGEN AND GREEK PATRISTIC  
THEOLOGY. (In *The World's Epoch*  
*Makers Series.*) *Crown 8vo. 4s. net.*

FROM THE EXILE TO THE ADVENT.  
(In the Series of *Handbooks for Bible*  
*Classes and Private Students.*)

Tenth Thousand. *Crown 8vo. 3s. net.*

---

T. & T. CLARK

## **THE BACKGROUND OF THE EPISTLES**



TO  
THE DEAR MEMORY OF  
"MARY"  
WIFE OF SIR ERNEST BURDON  
AUDITOR-GENERAL OF INDIA

*Multis illa bonis flebilis occidit*

# THE BACKGROUND OF THE EPISTLES

BY

WILLIAM FAIRWEATHER, M.A., D.D.(EDIN.)  
"

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1935

BS3635  
F2

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY  
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON: SIMPKIN MARSHALL, LIMITED

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS



1128608

## PREFACE

IN this book I have tried to respond to the friendly suggestion of Principal D. S. Cairns, D.D., Church of Scotland College, Aberdeen, that I should write as a companion volume to *The Background of the Gospels* another upon *The Background of the Epistles*. As in the former only the Jewish background was dealt with, relatively more space is given to the Pagan background in this, especially with reference to religion. The sketch of Roman dominion in Judæa is simply historical, and not a treatment of Judaism. A discussion of Jewish religious life at the time of Christ could not, however, be omitted, and will be found in its appropriate place under the category of the Jewish world.

Of late a favourite motto has been : " Back to the Jesus of the Gospels." Underlying this is the implication, more or less avowed, that the apostolic presentation of Christian truth is either out of keeping with, or to some extent at least a perversion of, the pure and simple message enshrined in the recorded words and deeds of the Master Himself. But it has never yet been proved that there is any real opposition between the Gospels and their interpretation in the Epistles.

That there is an urgent need for getting back to the study of the Epistles is beyond question. After all, who so competent to interpret the Gospels as the writers of the letters to the Christian communities of their day ? They all wrote out of their own experience, and in harmonious combination set forth clearly the nature and scope of the duties incumbent on followers of Jesus. The ethical urge

of the apostolic writings coincides with one of the most pressing needs of our time. Recognition of the fact that we are the inheritors of transmitted spiritual experience should lead to a more manifest response in an intensive study of the NT Epistles.

The ground covered in the following pages is so vast that the treatment may well appear slight and inadequate. Severe compression, however, is inevitable in any attempt to furnish even a bird's-eye view of the world of thought and action lying behind the Epistles, and in the fragmentary outline here presented there is no pretence of competition with any of the numerous works on every department of such an overwhelmingly many-sided theme. The object of this survey is the more modest one of indicating the track to the reader who seeks to explore for himself, either in its main features or in some of its bypaths, a field of investigation fitted to throw light upon an important section of the New Testament.

In Part Two, where more or less detailed lists are given of passages in which parallels occur between books belonging to the post-canonical Jewish literature and the NT Epistles, the convenience of students has been specially kept in view. Other readers may disregard these comparisons without losing touch with the general topic. This applies also to other sections of the work in which a similar feature appears.

It does not belong to our task to enter upon problems of date and authorship, or to deal with the general theological content of the Epistles. It is, however, assumed that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by the Apostle Paul, while the Pauline authorship of the great Epistle to the Ephesians, so much debated among scholars, is left an open question.

I have ventured to repeat the paragraph on the Maccabæan revolt—a subject which I have handled several times already—from the article "Israel," contributed to *The Harmsworth Encyclopædia*; one or two

paragraphs from *The Pre-Exilic Prophets*, in "The Temple Series of Bible Handbooks"; and also, by the courtesy of Chicago University Press, with some alterations and additions, an article "Concerning the Jewish Dispersion" in *The Journal of Religion* for April 1929.

The abbreviations OT and NT need no explanation.

Except in quotations, the "St." conventionally prefixed to the names of the Apostles has been omitted.

Dr. Moffatt's translations have been frequently utilized.

So immeasurable is the literature of the subject that I have not attempted to set it down *in extenso*. In Angus's *The Environment of Early Christianity* even a selection from it covers thirty-six printed pages! Students will find ample details in this list, in Schürer's *HJP*, and in Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the NT*.

It remains only to thank my son, W. M. Fairweather, B.Com., for substantial help in writing the section on the Roman Dominion in Judæa, for reading the proofs, and compiling the Index; and also Principal Cairns, for stimulating encouragement and helpful counsel in the preparation of this essay, though, of course, he is not responsible for any of the views expressed.

W. FAIRWEATHER.

EDINBURGH, *April* 1935.



Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατέραςιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ.—Heb. i. 1-2.

“The better knowledge now becoming available of the background of late Jewish thought which lies behind the ideas of Jesus Christ and the theology of the Apostle Paul is one means of bringing new light to bear on New Testament problems. A deeper knowledge of the Greek world into which Christianity came, its language, its religion, its life, is another. Palestinian customs, Jewish apocalypses, Philo, the Septuagint, Greek religion and philosophy, the freshly examined and tested utterances of the Church Fathers, and truer notions of religious psychology, modern as well as ancient, all these can contribute to that body of learning from which will come new points of view and better answers to our questions about the New Testament history.”—J. R. Ropes, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 9 f.





# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	V

## PART ONE

### *THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND*

I. THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD . . . . .	3
1. The Greek Spirit . . . . .	3
(1) Marked by originality, freshness, and simplicity . . . . .	4
(2) Attached the highest value to reason and beauty . . . . .	5
(3) The Greek the champion of freedom . . . . .	6
(4) The Hellenic race lacking in moral genius . . . . .	7
(5) Greek cosmopolitanism in religion . . . . .	7
2. The Jews under Greek Dominion after Alexander the Great . . . . .	8
(1) The Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ . . . . .	8
(2) The Maccabæan revolt and the dynasty of the Hasmonæans . . . . .	10
3. The Spirit of Rome . . . . .	14
(1) Practical bent of Roman mentality as contrasted with the Greek . . . . .	14
(2) Contribution to the development of architecture . . . . .	15
(3) Importance assigned to family life . . . . .	15
(4) Predilection for rural life . . . . .	15
(5) Firmness of character : devotion to duty . . . . .	16
(6) Influence of Roman law . . . . .	17
4. The Roman Dominion at the Dawn of the Christian Era . . . . .	18
5. General Features of Roman Rule . . . . .	19
(1) Based on material force . . . . .	19
(2) A triumph of external organization . . . . .	20

	PAGE
6. Positive and Negative Preparation for Christianity . . . . .	23
(1) Fusion of the peoples into a single empire . . . . .	23
(2) Development of the idea of citizenship . . . . .	24
(3) Improved means of communication . . . . .	24
(4) Pitiless tyranny of Roman dominion . . . . .	24
(5) Degeneration of family discipline into despotism . . . . .	25
7. Social Life and Ethics in the Græco-Roman World . . . . .	27
(1) Growth of militarism, extravagance, and class hatred . . . . .	27
(2) Suppression of the middle class . . . . .	28
(3) Decay of the ancient frugality, industry, and virtue . . . . .	29
(4) Prevalence of slavery and its moral effects . . . . .	30
(5) The passionate pursuit of pleasure : demoralizing exhibitions of the arena . . . . .	33
8. The Roman Dominion in Judæa . . . . .	36
(1) Occasion of Rome's intervention . . . . .	36
(2) Course of events under Hyrcanus II. (B.C. 63-40) . . . . .	37
(3) Antigonus the last occupant of the Hasmonæan throne (B.C. 40-37) . . . . .	40
(4) The Herods as vassal-kings (B.C. 37-A.D. 41) : Archelaus as Ethnarch (B.C. 4-A.D. 6) . . . . .	41
(a) Herod the Great (B.C. 37-4) . . . . .	41
(b) The Sons of Herod . . . . .	47
(i) Philip (B.C. 4-A.D. 34) . . . . .	47
(ii) Antipas (B.C. 4-A.D. 39) . . . . .	47
(iii) Archelaus as Ethnarch (B.C. 4-A.D. 6) . . . . .	48
(5) A Roman Census and Rise of the Zealots . . . . .	50
(6) Judæa under Roman Procurators. Pontius Pilate : his dismissal by the legate of Syria . . . . .	51
(7) Troubles under Caligula (A.D. 37-41), and restoration of Herod's kingdom under his grandson . . . . .	53
(8) Agrippa I. (A.D. 41-44) . . . . .	55
(9) Reinstatement of procuratorial system in Judæa : the Roman Procurators (A.D. 44-66) . . . . .	57
(10) The Jewish War with Rome (A.D. 66-73) . . . . .	64
(11) Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and end of the Jewish State . . . . .	68

	PAGE
II. THE JEWISH WORLD . . . . .	72
A. In Palestine . . . . .	72
1. <i>Jewish Civil, Social, and Cultural Life at the Time of Christ</i> . . . . .	72
(1) The land of Palestine . . . . .	72
(2) The inhabitants of Palestine . . . . .	81
(3) The common speech of Palestine . . . . .	84
(4) Courts of justice . . . . .	86
(5) Trade and industry . . . . .	90
(6) Domestic life and manners . . . . .	94
(7) Social conditions . . . . .	98
2. <i>Jewish Religious Life at the Time of Christ</i> . . . . .	103
(1) The Priesthood and the Temple services . . . . .	105
(2) The order of the Scribes and worship of the syna- gogue . . . . .	107
(3) Jewish Parties . . . . .	111
(a) The Pharisees and Sadducees . . . . .	111
(b) The Essenes and the Zealots . . . . .	117
(4) The Jews a people of the law . . . . .	122
(5) The Messianic hope . . . . .	125
(a) Development of the older Messianic idea . . . . .	125
(b) Extent to which this historical development is reflected in the Jewish literature of the period . . . . .	126
(c) Doctrinal content of the Messianic hope . . . . .	133
(a) Advent of the Messiah . . . . .	134
(β) Final onset and destruction of the hostile heathen . . . . .	135
(γ) The kingdom of the future in the Holy Land . . . . .	136
(δ) The new heaven and the new earth . . . . .	138
(ε) The resurrection and the last judgment . . . . .	138
B. In the Dispersion . . . . .	140
(1) The facts concerning the Dispersion . . . . .	140
(2) Political and municipal standing of the Jews of the Dispersion . . . . .	145
(3) Relation of foreign Jews to the Mother-country . . . . .	146
(4) Proselytes to Judaism . . . . .	148
(5) Jewish propagandism . . . . .	151
(6) Treatment of proselytes by born Jews . . . . .	153
(7) 1 Peter addressed to Christian Jews of the Dispersion . . . . .	153

## PART TWO

## THE LITERARY BACKGROUND

	PAGE
I. THE OLD TESTAMENT WRITINGS . . . . .	157
II. POST-CANONICAL LITERATURE : Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT. Their influence upon the NT Epistles, specially as regards—	159
1. The sharp distinction drawn between the present and the future age . . . . .	189
2. A developed angelology and demonology . . . . .	189
3. The conception of the resurrection and of a world judgement at the change of æons . . . . .	191
4. The expectation of the nearness of the end . . . . .	192
III. THE GREEK ELEMENT IN THE EPISTLES . . . . .	193
IV. THE ROMAN ELEMENT VERY SLIGHT . . . . .	196

## PART THREE

## THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

## I. PAGANISM AS REPRESENTED BY—

I. GREEK RELIGIOUS THOUGHT . . . . .	201
(1) The Poetic Development from Homer to Sophocles	201
(a) The Olympian theology : Homer and Hesiod	201
(b) The Orphic theology . . . . .	205
(c) The Odes of Pindar . . . . .	206
(d) The religious element in Greek Tragedy : Æschylus and Sophocles . . . . .	207
(e) The age of the Sophists and its poetical interpreter Euripides . . . . .	211
(2) The Philosophical Development—	
(a) The pre-Socratic natural philosophy . . . . .	216
(b) Socrates and Plato . . . . .	216
(c) The philosophy of Aristotle . . . . .	230
(d) Later philosophical developments . . . . .	237
(i) The Cynics . . . . .	237
(ii) The Stoics and Epicureans . . . . .	237
(iii) The Sceptics . . . . .	247
(iv) The Neo-Pythagoreans . . . . .	248
(v) The philosophy of Philo . . . . .	248
(vi) The Neoplatonists . . . . .	250

	PAGE
2. ROMAN RELIGION . . . . .	251
3. THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS . . . . .	258
(1) The Eleusinian Mysteries . . . . .	259
(2) The Phrygian cult of the Great Mother Cybele (with Attis) . . . . .	261
(3) The Egyptian Isis . . . . .	262
(4) The Hermetic Mystery books . . . . .	265
(5) Popularity of the Mysteries and their defects . . . . .	267
4. THE PARSI RELIGION . . . . .	273
(1) Founded by Zoroaster . . . . .	273
(2) Represents the transformation of the ancient Iranian folk-religion . . . . .	275
(3) The sacred books of the Parsis . . . . .	275
(4) The world viewed as composing two kingdoms, that of light and that of darkness, ruled respectively by Ahura (Ormazd) and Ahriman —the conflicting powers of good and evil . . . . .	277
(5) The Zoroastrian ethic . . . . .	279
(6) Persian influence on the OT, and in particular on the later Jewish literature . . . . .	281
II. OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL—	292
1. The Hebrew Prophets—their doctrine of God and of duty . . . . .	293
2. The Jews gave unique development to the religious and ethical side of human nature . . . . .	302

## PART FOUR

### THE DOCTRINAL BACKGROUND

I. THE FACT OF SIN—	307
The NT doctrine of sin relates itself closely to OT conceptions . . . . .	308
II. THE FACT OF CHRIST—	316
1. A fact of pre-existence. The Pauline statements (in Col 1 <sup>18ff.</sup> , Phil 2 <sup>6ff.</sup> etc.) not influenced by the Philonic idea of a pre- existent "heavenly man" . . . . .	317

## 2. A fact of history.

- (1) In Pauline letters not much allusion to the earthly life of Jesus, yet the apostle evidently no stranger to the historical tradition regarding Him . . . . . 325
- (2) Reminiscences of the Master in the First Epistle of Peter . . . . . 326
- (3) The human personality of Jesus emphasized in the Epistle to the Hebrews . . . . . 329
- (4) Collective testimony of the Epistles to the Incarnation asserts the sinlessness of Jesus . . . . . 329
- (5) References in the NT letters to the death and resurrection of Jesus . . . . . 330
- (6) The NT doctrine of the Christ based on the historical fact that He suffered under Pontius Pilate . . . . . 333
- (7) Primitive Christianity inseparably bound up with the historic Jesus . . . . . 334
- (8) According to the NT Epistles the earthly career of Jesus not *merely* an event of history, but the revelation of the truth about God, and the unique basis of "salvation" . . . . . 334
- (9) Through Christ we are first raised to fellowship with God . . . . . 334
- (10) Faith "the only possible Key to the Jesus of history" . . . . . 335

## 3. A fact of experience

## Illustrated from—

- (1) The Pauline Epistles . . . . . 337
  - (a) Paul's position with reference to the Jewish law . . . . . 337
  - (b) His experience of the power of sin and of its removal through the gift of God in Christ . . . . . 340
  - (c) His strong assertion of Christian freedom . . . . . 342
  - (d) His sense of the supreme significance of Christ's death . . . . . 344
  - (e) His sense of the universality and levelling nature of Christianity . . . . . 345
  - (f) His conscious union with Christ . . . . . 346
  - (g) His yearning after ever fuller spiritual enlightenment . . . . . 347
  - (h) His absolute devotion to the service of his Lord . . . . . 348
  - (i) Walking by faith and not by sight . . . . . 349
  - (j) His assurance of a blessed immortality . . . . . 350

	PAGE
(2) The First Epistle of Peter . . . . .	352
(a) In general agreement with the teaching of the Pauline letters . . . . .	352
(b) Gives less prominence to the mystical union with Christ, but like the Epistles of Paul is based upon the fact of Christ's vicarious sufferings and upon the writer's own personal experience . . . . .	352
(c) Purifying effect of the trial of our faith, which is destined to end in glory . . . . .	353
(d) Exemplary character of the sufferings of Christ, which are the only source of redemption for mankind as a whole . . . . .	353
(3) The First Epistle of John . . . . .	354
(a) Fellowship with Jesus essential to the Christian life . . . . .	354
(b) This fellowship not incompatible with the consciousness of sin . . . . .	355
(c) Confession of sin secures forgiveness and "cleansing," which deepens the sense of sin . . . . .	356
(d) Christ our Advocate with the Father—at once high-priest and victim . . . . .	356
(e) The Christian appropriates the remedy for sin . . . . .	356
(f) This expiatory offering available for "the sins of the whole world" . . . . .	357
(g) The reality of the remedy not less firmly established than the reality of sin itself . . . . .	357
(h) The Christian treads the way of holiness, walking "in the light," practising love to the brethren, and confident in prayer . . . . .	357
(i) The Christian certainties . . . . .	358
(4) The Epistle of James . . . . .	359
(a) Exceptions to general absence of doctrinal teaching . . . . .	360
(b) Prominence given to "Wisdom" . . . . .	361
(c) Christian joy in trial . . . . .	361
(d) "Faith without works is dead"; no real contradiction between this and the teaching of Paul . . . . .	361
(5) The Epistle of Jude . . . . .	362
(a) Impeachment of "ungodly men" . . . . .	362
(b) Appeal to Christian readers to contend for "the faith once for all committed to the saints" . . . . .	363
(c) The writer's ideal of the Christian life . . . . .	363



	PAGE
(6) The Second Epistle of Peter . . . . .	363
(a) Exhortation to Christians to seek a fuller knowledge of the Christian salvation . . . . .	363
(b) Warning against false teachers . . . . .	363
(c) Reply to scoffers who denied the second Advent . . . . .	363
(d) The writer condemns perversion of Paul's doctrine of grace . . . . .	364
(7) The Epistle to the Hebrews . . . . .	364
(a) Religious condition of those addressed . . . . .	364
(b) Superiority of the Christian to the Jewish dispensation . . . . .	364
(c) The death of Christ viewed as a priestly act . . . . .	365
(d) Loyalty to the faith commended from example of OT saints, and from that of Jesus Himself . . . . .	366
(e) Personal standpoint of the writer . . . . .	367
 III. THE FACT OF THE SPIRIT . . . . .	 368
1. The OT usage . . . . .	368
2. The spirit in the NT Epistles—mainly viewed from the side of practical experience . . . . .	370
3. The personality of the Spirit . . . . .	371
4. Use of the neuter pronoun " It " with reference to the Spirit . . . . .	371
5. Paul's conception of the Spirit . . . . .	372
(1) Its relation to Christ . . . . .	372
(2) Reception of the Spirit the ruling principle of the Christian life . . . . .	373
(3) The Spirit's working practically interchangeable with that of the indwelling Christ. . . . .	373
(4) Spiritual gifts of an abnormal type: these of inferior value to those " fruits " of the Spirit which bear an ethical stamp . . . . .	373
6. The First Epistle of Peter . . . . .	375
(1) Emphasis on " the sanctification of the Spirit " . . . . .	375
(2) Christ after being put to death in the flesh came to life in the Spirit . . . . .	375
(3) The Spirit's working in the dimmer prophetic anticipation and in the clearer declaration of the Christian preachers. Both were God's messengers . . . . .	375

	PAGE
7. The First Epistle of John . . . . .	375
(1) Like Christ Himself primarily, Christians are the Lord's anointed. Oil emblematic of the unction of the Spirit . . . . .	376
(2) Assurance that God abideth in us due to the Spirit . . . . .	376
(3) Confession of Jesus Christ as come in the flesh a test of the knowledge of the Spirit of God .	376
(4) We receive only a measure of the gift of the Spirit	376
(5) The Spirit bears witness to the coming of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God . . . . .	377
8. The Epistle to the Hebrews . . . . .	378
(1) The divine presence and approval attested by spiritual gifts accompanying the apostolic preaching . . . . .	378
(2) Passages of the OT referred to as the testimony of the Holy Spirit . . . . .	378
(3) Participation in the Spirit goes along with " the heavenly gift " bestowed in response to faith	378
(4) Christ's blood avails to cleanse the conscience. " The spiritual nature of the sacrifice gave it eternal validity " . . . . .	378
(5) The Holy Spirit as " the Spirit of grace " . . . . .	379

### GENERAL CONCLUSION

1. Just as, apart from the fact of Christ as the supreme event in history, there is no rational explanation of the existence of His Church in the world to-day, so also, apart from the fact of the Spirit, no credible explanation can be given of the success of the apostolic preaching of the gospel and its further spread in the early centuries of the Christian era . . . . .	380
2. At the present day the New Testament Epistles, as exhibiting the practical results of an ethically empowering Spirit, demand specially intensive and careful study . . . . .	381
3. They furnish an inspiration to endeavourers after the Christian life, and a corrective to the pessimism of the spiritually despairing . . . . .	381
APPENDIX—NOTES . . . . .	383
INDEX . . . . .	393



# LIST OF NOTES

(SEE APPENDIX)

	PAGE
NOTE I. <i>Roman Procurators in Judæa</i> . . . . .	383
„ 2. <i>Agrippa II.</i> . . . . .	385
„ 3. <i>Schweitzer on Apocalyptic Thought in Relation to Jewish Eschatology</i> . . . . .	386
„ 4. <i>Christian Churches and the Jewish Problem</i> . . . . .	387
„ 5. <i>Concerning Beliar</i> . . . . .	388
„ 6. <i>The Odes of Solomon</i> . . . . .	388
„ 7. <i>The Name Jesus</i> . . . . .	389
„ 8. <i>Contents of the Zend-Avesta</i> . . . . .	390
„ 9. <i>Origen's View concerning the Resurrection-body</i> . . . . .	391



PART ONE  
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND



## CHAPTER I

### THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD

As is well known, the conquests of Alexander the Great marked a new era in the history of the ancient world. By the broadcasting of Greek culture, the bringing together of East and West, the removal of national barriers and the obliteration of racial distinctions, he inaugurated a world-wide movement towards that recognition of the brotherhood of man which culminated in the *pax Romana* and the closing of the Temple of Janus under Augustus.

#### I. THE GREEK SPIRIT

Although the Greek and Latin elements in the history and civilization of the Mediterranean region can be broadly distinguished as those of thought and practice, or reason and authority, the two streams had mingled their waters centuries before the institution of the Roman Empire under Augustus. Their confluence meant a great inheritance for the world. It is not too much to say that the development both of modern culture and of Christianity itself can be intelligently seen only against the background of the resultant Græco-Roman civilization. The Greeks contributed in especial the scientific spirit, a wealth of ideas, and the intensive study of the nature of man and the importance of character ; the Romans, their epoch-making system of law, and lessons in the political and practical administration of affairs.

Monumental as are the extant creations of Greek literature and art in themselves, their chief value



consists in the spirit which underlay them. For to the revival of this spirit we owe the Renaissance, and on one side of it the Reformation also. It burst the iron bands of mediæval theology and philosophy, and restored to men a free outlook upon nature and human life. The stimulating influence of the Greek spirit is reflected in manifold directions in the course of European history. It proved an inspiration alike to Christendom and to Islam. As a factor in the history of civilization the Greek spirit was not only of supreme importance ; it was something unique.

What, then, were its leading characteristics ? (1) First-handedness. It was marked by originality, freshness, and simplicity—qualities inseparable from all true greatness.

Few new ideas in philosophical thought have emerged since the fourth century B.C., and owing to the extraordinary capacity of the Greek tongue to express the most delicate shades of meaning, no translation can ever adequately reproduce the gems of Hellenic literature. The Greek genius rose to a height of brilliance unequalled in the history of the human race, and produced a galaxy of writers whose cleverness and sparkle, speculative insight, and dialectic skill are the abiding glory of the educated world. The old Greek thinkers had also the dew of the morning. They wrote under the influence of vital hope, and their mood was shared by the people generally. Of a lively, energetic, and emotional temperament, the Greek was full of the *joie de vivre*, and of appreciation for "youth and bloom and this delightful world." He was intensely interested in the awards of the coveted olive crown to the victors at the Olympic contests. Yet there was another side to the shield. As the counterpart of his joy in life and the material world the Greek entertained a profound sense of man's frailty, of the transitoriness of life, and of the overshadowing presence of death. While this explains the vein of

melancholy running through the national literature, it had no paralysing effect upon the typical Greek, but rather spurred him on to high endeavour. With the spark of creative genius and the tender blossom of hope was conjoined the charm of simplicity. Greek poets and artists knew the secret of reticence; they always left scope for the imagination of reader or beholder. "Study a Greek bas-relief, for example, and you will find that its simplicity—perhaps inevitableness would be the better term—is the outcome of nice adjustments all tending to create the same impression in the mind of the observer."<sup>1</sup>

(2) It attached the highest value to reason and beauty. The readiness of the Oriental to accept the traditional without subjecting it to the arbitrament of reason was entirely foreign to Hellas. Just as the Greeks gave no unreasoning obedience to despots, so they assented to nothing without discussion. Old and new alike had to run the gauntlet of criticism. Thus, apart from the positive ideas put forward by Hellenic thought, it gave to the world a new and disinterested way of looking at things which in itself was a gift of inestimable price. The Greek historian, for instance, wrote with perfect detachment, careful only to record events as they happened, and to let the facts speak for themselves; he did not seek to be either advocate or critic. In whatever direction it might be tested or applied the Greek method was essentially rational, being based on observation and experiment. The modern scientist is in this respect but the Greek philosopher of later date. He has surpassed the Greek, but it was the Greek who shewed him the way. In their pursuit of experimental knowledge the Greeks practised a studied "moderation." Their favourite maxim was "Nothing too much." They had a keen sense of proportion. Everything, they taught, should have a duly proportioned beginning,

<sup>1</sup> E. B. Osborn, *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, p. 28.

middle, and end, so as to form an artistic whole. As the frank and sane expression of what met their observation their plastic and literary work reflected the racial instinct for "moderation." They were essentially idealists for whom the perfection of their work mattered much more than their own personality.

Combined with the homage paid by the Greeks to reason was their adoration of beauty. To them "Beauty was a divine thing, and worthy of a certain reverent admiration, akin to worship, as much as genius is felt to be by us."<sup>1</sup> As seekers after truth they identified truth with beauty, and the elements in beauty which chiefly appealed to them was that of harmonious structural form. Artistically, they achieved a rare degree of perfection. Devotees of art as well as of science, they united the highest flights of imagination with adherence to strictly systematic reason. Besides being pioneers in metaphysics and philosophy, they excelled in sculpture and architecture, in painting, poetry, and music, and in all that appertains to the love of the beautiful. Like the poet Keats they held that

A thing of beauty is a joy for ever.

(3) The Greek was the champion of freedom, not only in the realm of thought but also in the affairs of individual and social life. Conscious of his own value as a free and self-respecting citizen of a free state, he had the air of a man accustomed to look the whole world in the face. These qualities made Greeks the best of soldiers, and their services as mercenaries were in great demand. Politically, they shewed much theoretical and no little practical capacity, and by their efforts to steer between tyranny and anarchy they carried through experiments in government which forestalled nearly all our latter-day theories. The internal strife frequently thus generated was the inevitable result of their bold

<sup>1</sup> John Stuart Blackie, *On Beauty*, i. p. 3.

endeavours to secure a well-ordered freedom. As colonizers the Greeks had no equals in the ancient world. Of this the very names of Syracuse, Byzantium, and (Macedonian) Alexandria afford sufficient proof. In the kindred sphere of commerce, too, the Hellenic spirit proved itself active, and gave rise to great mercantile centres like Rhodes, which in the third century B.C. financed the entire trade of the Mediterranean.

(4) In spite of the ethical bent of Æschylus, and a stray saying like that of Euripides that evil is implanted in all men,<sup>1</sup> moral genius cannot be claimed for the Hellenic race. They had little sense of original sin, and thought too lightly of moral delinquency. Indeed, "there is no people in history that has come near the Greeks, first in inclination to and talent for veiling evil under forms agreeable to the sense and æsthetically beautiful, and then in readiness to apologize for it."<sup>2</sup> Edmund Burke, when properly enough condemning the unchivalrous treatment meted out to the French Queen, Marie Antoinette, declared that under such refined and delicate conditions as those obtaining at her court, "vice itself lost half its evil by losing all its grossness." In this flagrantly false utterance he gave pointed and accurate, if also unconscious, expression to the laxity of Greek moral sentiment.

(5) Religiously, the Hellenic culture was marked by a freedom and tolerance that knew no distinction of races or persons. It was content that all should contribute their quota to human knowledge or happiness, and on the strength of such contribution take their place within the spacious temple of civilization. Only one condition was exacted, namely, that it should be done in Greek. Yet no new religious cult could be introduced into Athens without permission, and offences against the State religion, such as blaspheming the gods or desecrating

<sup>1</sup> *Ap. Stob. Foril.*, x. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, Eng. tr., i. p. 311.

what was accounted sacred, were usually punishable with death. On the other hand, no protest seems ever to have been made against the ridiculing of a god on the Athenian stage. At first Greek religion, both in theology and ritual, had much in common with that of other nations, but under the influence of philosophy and art the coarser elements of ignorance and ugliness were gradually set aside. In the case of the better minds, at all events, the mystical and superstitious element—the observance of magical rites and ceremonies, and all the embroidery of the imaginations and the affections—was eliminated. “What is characteristic of the Greeks is not the material, but their handling of it.”<sup>1</sup>

## 2. THE JEWS UNDER GREEK DOMINION AFTER ALEXANDER THE GREAT

### (1) *The Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ*

It is, of course, chiefly in their relation to Palestine and the Jewish people that we are here concerned with the Egyptian and Syrian kings. In view of the apparently considerable dispersion of Jews within their dominions and of the geographical position of Palestine—which lay directly between their territories, and was exposed to risks connected with the movements of their battalions—they were inevitably brought into close contact with the Hebrew race, under conditions friendly or the reverse.

After the defeat of Darius III. Codomannus by Alexander the Great at Issus in B.C. 333, Syria passed from the Persian supremacy to the Greek. Although this transference of overlordship was welcomed by the Jews, it is scarcely likely that the conqueror granted them all the special privileges vouched for by Josephus. When the Empire was divided after the battle of Ipsus in B.C. 301 Palestine was assigned to Ptolemy I. Soter,

<sup>1</sup> J. E. Harrison, *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, p. 13.

and for a century thereafter remained under Egyptian rule. The name of the first Ptolemy is honourably associated with the founding of the museum (Serapeum) and library of Alexandria. Literary interests, with important reactions upon Judaism, were further promoted under his son Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (284-247), during whose reign the Septuagint or Greek translation of the OT was begun. Although his successor Ptolemy III. Euergetes (247-222) was more of a man of war than his two predecessors, he shared their literary and scientific interests, and was so well disposed towards the Jews that he even offered sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem. Certainly during the reigns of the first three Ptolemies the Jews continued to prosper, and their Palestinian brethren, while exposed to the perils of their situation between the two rival powers, likewise enjoyed comparative tranquillity. But under the next monarch, Ptolemy IV. Philopator (221-204), they experienced a change for the worse. Antiochus III. the Great, king of Syria (223-187), having attempted to seize upon Palestine and Coele-Syria because of the planting of an Egyptian garrison in Seleucia, was met and defeated at Raphia in B.C. 217. Thereafter, according to the legendary narrative of 3 Maccabees, Ptolemy toured the Eastern provinces, and at Jerusalem was struck down by paralysis when about to violate the inner sanctuary. Certain it is, however, that on his return to Egypt he maltreated the Jews and left them at the mercy of their Greek and Egyptian antagonists. On the accession of his son Ptolemy V. Epiphanes (204-181), the kings of Macedonia and Syria entered into a compact to seize upon and partition between them Palestine and other outlying parts of Egyptian territory. After being heavily defeated by Antiochus at Panias in B.C. 198, Ptolemy agreed to marry the daughter of the Syrian king, to hand over Coele-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine as her dowry, and to accept one-half of the revenues. Palestine thus

became part of the Seleucid Kingdom. Routed by the Romans, first at Thermopylæ, and later at Magnesia in B.C. 190, Antiochus was in such financial straits to pay the indemnity imposed upon him that he was driven to the wretched expedient of robbing temples within the diminished territory still left to him by the conquerors. Having met his death while on one of these raiding expeditions, he was succeeded by his son Seleucus IV. Philopator (187-176), in whose time Jerusalem was torn by party strife between two priestly families—the Oniadæ, partisans of the high-priest Onias III., and the Tobiadæ, led by the Benjamite Simon—and imbued with Hellenistic sympathies and tastes.

(2) *The Maccabæan Revolt and the Dynasty of the  
Hasmonæans*

Judaism had now begun to feel the aggressive influence of that Hellenic culture which Alexander's conquests had diffused over the then civilized world; but while the process of Hellenization went on in Judæa as elsewhere, it had there to face a strong antagonistic element. The Hasidæans (Heb. *Ḥasīdīm*, "the pious") constituted themselves the champions of the law. As the Greek party had captured the priestly nobility, they now attempted to Hellenize Jewish life even on its religious side. The high-priest Onias III. was superseded by his brother Jason, who purchased from Antiochus IV. Epiphanes (175-164) the sacred office, together with liberty to set up a gymnasium in Jerusalem. Within three years Jason was in turn supplanted by one Menelaus, who entirely abjured the Jewish faith, and in reward received military aid from Antiochus against the recalcitrant Jason. A false report that Antiochus had died in Egypt led Jason to attack Jerusalem, and Menelaus had to take refuge in the citadel. The Syrian king interpreted these disturbances as a Jewish revolt, and, on his return from Egypt in B.C. 170, plundered the temple of Jeru-

saalem and slew many of the inhabitants. Two years later his general Apollonius devastated the city, and a Syrian garrison was placed in the fortress. An attempt was then made to extirpate Jewish rites and establish pagan customs by force. Sabbath observance and circumcision were forbidden; an idol altar was erected in the Temple, and sacrifices offered to Zeus ("the abomination of desolation, Dn 9<sup>27</sup>"); copies of the law, when found, were destroyed. Those who refused to give up Jewish in favour of heathen practices were put to death. Rather than fight on the Sabbath, no fewer than a thousand let themselves be slain. But, unless the Jews were to be exterminated, such a policy had to be abandoned, and naturally there arose a fierce religious war. The revolt was led by Mattathias, an aged priest, who, with his five sons, was joined by all who were ready to fight, even upon the Sabbath if necessary, for their ancestral faith. Acting on the aggressive, they began to stamp out heathenism from the land. At his death (B.C. 155), shortly after the war broke out, Mattathias bequeathed the leadership to his son Judas, surnamed Maccabæus (= "hammerer"; hence the name Maccabees as applied to his sons and descendants). This war of independence stands out as the most heroic episode in Israelitish history. Judas proved himself an ideal general. After defeating in succession the Syrian commanders Apollonius, Seron, and Gorgias, he overcame the viceroy Lysias at Beth-zur, and in holy wrath proceeded to cleanse, fortify, and rededicate the Temple of Jerusalem (B.C. 165). The moral effect of all this was very great; the Hellenistic party was overawed, and the adherents of the law were greatly heartened. Soon afterwards Judas had again to meet Lysias in the field, and was forced to secure himself in the Temple fortress. The prospect was ominous enough for the Jewish insurgents when Lysias, obliged to return to Antioch in order to retain the regency, unexpectedly granted them



by treaty the free exercise of their religion (B.C. 162). The Hasidæans saw no cause for further warfare, but Judas and his brethren determined to fight for political independence as well. Again the Syrians were defeated, and Nicanor was slain at Adasa in B.C. 161, on the 13th Adar (March), afterwards kept as "Nicanor's day." But a fresh army was instantly sent to Judæa under Bacchides, and Judas, overcome by sheer weight of numbers, fell at Elasa, in April of the same year. In spite of this irreparable disaster, the cause of Jewish self-government continued to advance under the leadership of Jonathan, the brother of Judas. If not specially distinguished as a soldier, he excelled as a diplomatist, and by taking skilful advantage of the troubled situation in Syria secured for himself in B.C. 150 the high-priesthood and in B.C. 150 the dignity of "captain and governor of a province" (1 Macc 10<sup>65</sup>). As, however, Demetrius II. failed to fulfil his promise to remove the Syrian garrisons from Judæa in return for Jonathan's services in quelling an insurrection in Antioch, the latter espoused the cause of his rival, Antiochus. But Jonathan was decoyed into Ptolemais, made prisoner, and eventually slain (B.C. 143). Simon now became leader of the Maccabæan party, and allied himself with Demetrius. A capable military commander, he not only got the better of Tryphon, general of Antiochus, but forced the Syrian garrison in Acra to capitulate (14<sup>2</sup>). Then he demanded and obtained complete independence for the Jews. The first year of Simon's reign was adopted as the commencement of a new era (Seleucid year 170 = B.C. 143-142); the first Jewish coins were struck, and the "yoke of the heathen was taken away." Under his wise administration the country enjoyed a period of peace and exceptional prosperity. Through the perfidy of Antiochus VII. Sidetes, Simon was once more involved in war; but his sons Judas and John, to whom he entrusted the campaign, routed the Syrians. In B.C. 135

Simon and two of his sons were treacherously slain in the castle of Dok, near Jericho, by his son-in-law Ptolemy, who coveted the supreme power. But Simon's third son, John Hyrcanus, governor of Gazara, anticipated him in the occupation of Jerusalem, and assumed the high-priesthood. The reign of Hyrcanus (135-105) was at first a troubled one, owing to the siege of Jerusalem by Antiochus VII., who imposed oppressive conditions of peace; but after the death of the Syrian monarch in B.C. 128, he successfully asserted his independence, and restored the Jewish kingdom to its ancient dimensions. This outward prosperity, however, was counterbalanced by much internal discord. It was in the reign of Hyrcanus that acute opposition was developed between the Pharisees and the Sadducees as political and religious parties; and his secession from the former to the latter served to emphasize the cleavage. On the death of Hyrcanus the crown was usurped by his son Aristobulus, who, after annexing Ituræa, in a fit of suspicion slew his brother Antigonus, and died of remorse in B.C. 104, having reigned only one year. He was succeeded by his brother Alexander Jannæus (104-78), a warlike prince who possessed himself of most of the towns on the Philistine coast and of the trans-Jordanic region. His Hellenistic sympathies brought him into collision with the Pharisees; and upon the populace, which rose in revolt, he took a bloodthirsty revenge. The Hasmonæan sceptre now passed to Salome Alexandra, the widow of Jannæus. For nine years (78-69) she ruled with tact and shrewdness. From the first she put herself in touch with the Pharisees, whose policy she adopted as regards internal administration, while retaining control of external affairs. Her elder son, Hyrcanus II., a weak nonentity, was appointed high-priest. Her younger son, the energetic Aristobulus II., who disliked the Pharisees and resented his exclusion from public affairs, seized several fortresses, and with an army menaced Jerusalem. At

this juncture Alexandra died, and Aristobulus soon succeeded in relegating Hyrcanus to private life. The kingdom of the Maccabees was now tottering to its fall.

### 3. THE SPIRIT OF ROME

Both in mind and character the Roman differed so widely from the Greek as to present a striking contrast at almost every point.

The speculative idealism and spiritual insight of the Hellenic race were lacking in the Roman. His mentality was essentially realistic, and of a prosaic, practical, and official type; he was imitative, not creative. Not the quest of the philosopher's stone, nor the soaring flights of poetic imagination, but the affairs of everyday life in this workaday world, engaged his attention. The abstractions of Greek intellectualism were altogether foreign to him. He was more concerned about the honours and responsibilities of a consul, procurator, or ædile, than about the nature of man, the riddle of the universe, or the aspects of the Infinite.

In the realms of science and art also the Romans were inferior to the Greeks. Theories about the origin, composition, and arrangement of the cosmos, the question concerning the influence of air currents upon the soul, the value of logic, conceptions of time and space, the nature and courses of the stars, and other similar problems, had little interest for them. The introduction of scientific novelties from other lands was even viewed as a slur upon their own ancient practice. They do not appear to have been keen students of physics, or of animal and vegetable life. In the department of medicine they lagged behind the Greeks, but eventually took over from the latter parts of their medical practice, and in particular developed the institution of the hospital, primarily for the benefit of wounded and invalided soldiers, and afterwards in the public interest. The artistic genius of the Greeks was not

shared by the Romans, although they did not, like the Egyptians, the Parthians, and still more the Palestinian Jews, repudiate its gifts and treat its advances with scorn. They even sought to identify their own gods with the Olympian deities, and unblushingly carried off many of the finest specimens of Greek art to embellish the dwellings of plutocrats on the banks of the Tiber. The Romans did, however, make a notable contribution to the development of architecture. In this phase of it the Greek genius attained its zenith in the form of the Greek temple; further developments were not forthcoming, and it conspicuously failed to reach out in the direction of the practical and utilitarian. It was left to Roman architects to fill this rôle, and they did it well. Walls, aqueducts, and bridges still attest their greatness as builders; yet their work was characterized by massiveness rather than by artistic beauty.

One of the most striking features of the spirit of Rome, and one of fundamental value, was the vast importance assigned to domestic life. Among the Latins, slaves and household gods were constituent parts of the family, which was thus a bigger thing than the family of modern days. Roman character and the Roman State were alike reared upon the basic foundation of home and family life. The Roman was deeply attached to his home, and although he had despotic power over his family, this seems on the whole to have been rarely abused. As we shall have occasion to revert to this later on, it may suffice to remark here that, apart from any question in regard to its excellencies or defects, family life among the Romans was a determining factor in the evolution of the spirit of the race.

In sharp contrast to the Greeks who, like the bulk of the population in Great Britain to-day, gravitated towards the cities and spent much of their time in places of public resort, the Romans shewed a marked predilection for rural life. Lovers of Nature, they felt

drawn by the kindly influences of trees and fountains, and by numerous other impersonal spirits such as those of the door (*Janus*) and the hearth (*Vesta*). To them the hills were friends, and flowers and ferns a constant joy. They could have said with Wordsworth—

The sounding cataract  
 Haunted me like a passion : the tall rock,  
 The mountain, and the deep and gloomy wood,  
 Their colours and their forms, were then to me  
 An appetite.

Communing thus with Nature, the Roman keenly enjoyed his *otium*, the rest and freedom from care and worry to be found in sylvan scenes and rustic quiet. Often has it been told how, after refraining from an angry attack on Rome as leader of a hostile army, Coriolanus, in response to a tender appeal from his family, returned to his exile among the Volscians. Proverbial also is Horace's perfect contentment with his retreat at his Sabine farm.<sup>1</sup> While the Greeks could admire and write eloquently of the beauties of Nature, they had none of the heartfelt liking for country life exhibited by the Latin race. If they could not all be actual cultivators of the soil, the Romans were deeply interested in agriculture and became skilled adepts in all matters of rural economy.

In point of character the Roman was distinguished by firmness and grim determination such as that exemplified in Cato's oft-repeated declaration, "Carthage must be destroyed." Proud even to insolence, he never feared death in the service of his country. His devotion to duty is finely reflected in the familiar case of the sentries who died at their posts when Pompeii was overwhelmed in the volcanic eruption of Vesuvius. The same feature was exhibited in the highest quarters also ; the Emperor Hadrian, for example, furnishes a shining instance of the virtuous man of noble ideals and splendid activities.

<sup>1</sup> Satis beatus unicis Sabinis.—(*Odes*, ii. 18.)

Most of the distinctive qualities of Roman character were indubitably forged in the home life of the people—the piety which revered tradition and civic institution; the gravity or solid sense which preferred established custom to the passing whims of innovators; the simplicity that clung to realities and discarded visionary dreams; the benevolence that looked with a kindly eye upon dependants, friends, and neighbours. On the reverse side of the shield, however, were engraved some ugly and less worthy features—the hostility between rich and poor, the prevalence of slum dwellings, the brutalities of the amphitheatre, and the heartless cruelty of women in the upper grades of society. But of this more anon.

If Roman character was largely moulded and developed by the atmosphere of the home, the same holds good of Roman law, which, apart from their military conquests, was the one signal and original work accomplished by the Roman people. *Unum sed leonem*. Roman law was no cunningly devised system struck from the skilled hands of a few experts, but a development of the discipline of family life, and the gradually accumulated product of the gathered experience of the Latin race. As head of a household the Roman citizen was legally invested with absolute power over all its members, and was under no restraint but that of his own will combined with a decent respect for public opinion. The idea underlying the entire structure of Roman legislation was that of so safeguarding private property as to make it absolutely secure. Such property included what was taken from enemies, and so long as it was not used to encroach on the rights of others, carried with it no obligation whatever; each might do what he would with his own booty. This led almost necessarily to the growth of an avaricious, hard, and merciless spirit. Debtors, prisoners, slaves, and the poverty-stricken, were treated with a selfish harshness devoid of kindly

human feeling. What wonder if the Roman people, steadily pursuing their aim of world-conquest, and practising such cruel oppression, imposed their iron yoke upon other nations as opportunity offered ?

#### 4. THE ROMAN DOMINION AT THE DAWN OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

For centuries the power of Rome had been steadily on the increase. Originally a city with only a few square miles of territory, it gradually annexed Latium and Italy, and then proceeded to subject the whole world to its sway. In seven hundred years it had become a kingdom embracing a population of almost a hundred millions. The great rival power of Carthage was broken at the battle of Zama (B.C. 202), and from that time Rome became undisputed mistress of the West. Half a century later, in B.C. 146, Macedonia became a Roman province, and the Senate appointed "a commission of ten" to reduce to order the chaotic state of affairs in European Greece, where, in spite of the freedom granted under the protectorate of the year 197, civic feuds continued to rage. As a result, some cities like Corinth and Thebes were destroyed, while those left standing were isolated, the inhabitants being at the same time disarmed and compelled to pay tribute. The whole peninsula from the Adriatic to the Ægean came under proconsular rule. In the Eastern Mediterranean also, by war and diplomacy, Rome extended her dominion until by the beginning of the Christian era the entire coast region from Troas to Cyrene became tributary to her. The Great Sea was practically "a Roman Lake." Palestine was now part of the Roman Empire. The establishment and spread of this remarkable world-power and the transformation thus wrought constituted a distinctive factor in the preparation on the path of history for the advent of Him who is "the desire of all nations." If there was a notable preparation for

Christianity in Hebrew religion and in Greek thought, there was also a well-marked *præparatio evangelica* in Roman polity.

### 5. GENERAL FEATURES OF ROMAN RULE

The general features of Roman rule are unmistakable. It was based upon material force, and was a triumph of external organization.

Never was the spirit of conquest more deeply rooted in any people. In pursuance of a fixed policy they made free use of the sword, and presented the mailed fist wherever they saw a favourable opportunity. The great representative name here is that of Julius Cæsar (B.C. 100–44). A military genius of the first order, he extended the boundary of the Roman Empire to the Rhine and put down rebellion in every part of Europe. Through his campaigns a firm foundation was laid for imperial rule. Not that the conqueror of Gaul was a mere soldier. He was also a statesman and an orator who left his mark upon the political and social life of his own age, and in this respect did much to shape the course of future history. As a writer of pure Latin he had few equals. In point of personal character he was a man of singular energy, dignity, and worth. Not inaptly has Shakespeare designated him “the foremost man in all this world,” and it is not unfitting that his name should so long have survived as the recognized title of sovereignty. Ready as they were to resort to the sword, however, the Romans were quite alive to the importance of diplomatic dealing with a view to securing their own ultimate supremacy. In forming alliances their motives were notoriously selfish. Their allies, besides having to accept a position of vassalage, could not count upon faith being kept with them a moment longer than it suited the interests of Rome to do so. And thus between fighting and craft she grew rapidly in power. World-wide dominion was her persistent object. That Rome



was in fact the very incarnation of strength is evidenced not only by her victories in war, but also by the magnificence and massiveness of her public works. Never was executed handiwork of better quality. Everything was made to last. Roads and bridges, harbours and aqueducts, temples and amphitheatres—all were built in so substantial a fashion as virtually to defy the ravages of time. To this day, as already indicated, those material structures bear witness to the wealth and enterprise and stability of the Roman State.

Roman rule was further characterized by a very complete system of external organization, alike as regards civil, military, and mercantile affairs. The civic life of Rome was in the hands of a body of magistrates—quæstors, ædiles, prætors, consuls, censors—under the Senate, an executive parliament of three hundred members which controlled all matters of legislation, religion, and finance, and conducted negotiations with foreign States. Great attention was paid to the organization of the army. Its divisions and subdivisions differed at different periods, changes being made as circumstances and experience dictated; but from first to last the efficiency of the troops was deemed of vital importance to the State, and the chief command was entrusted to the consuls as the highest ordinary magistrates. As roadmakers the Romans excelled all who had lived before then. Firm and durable highways were constructed from the capital to the most outlying parts of the Empire. Throughout Italy and the West an imperial service of post-horses and carriages was organized by Augustus, and inns established at all the principal stations. The Roman government was careful to preserve the security of the roads, and also made it its business to suppress piracy on the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. An immense impetus was thus given both to travel and to trade.

In Augustus Cæsar (B.C. 63–A.D. 14) the Romans

had a prince of administrators, just as in Julius Cæsar they had a prince of generals. Modelling his government upon the republican constitution and abjuring the title of king, Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus chose that of *Augustus*, which had hitherto been associated with the temples of the gods and all that was held most sacred, and this no doubt helped to pave the way towards the general belief in his divinity. But he was king in all except the name. As commander-in-chief and head of the Senate, as possessing the power of the consulship and the authority of the tribune, and as pontifex maximus, he was invested with all the prerogatives of monarchy. A member of the triumvirate, he had by proscription removed from his path most of those from whom he had anything to fear ; yet he took the precaution of securing to himself the direct control of the army and the provinces. His next care was to conciliate those likely to resent the slaughter of so many prominent citizens. A third aim which he kept before him in organizing the commonwealth was the creation of a party of personal adherents strong enough to counterbalance the class on whose loyalty he could not so securely count. Under this first emperor the bleeding State enjoyed a period of internal tranquillity and blessed peace, and was permeated by a new hopefulness. In after-times the Augustan Age was regarded as the most illustrious in the annals and literature of Rome. The great administrator from whom it derived its name was keenly concerned for the maintenance of law and order both in the capital and in the provinces. Civic, religious, and domestic life were alike dominated by the idea of *law*. There was unfaltering devotion to duty. Roman rule and Roman life were the very embodiment of the legal spirit. Even in his foreign policy, which was marked by an enlightened statesmanship, Augustus contrived to enforce the law with an impartiality and thoroughness previously unknown. Like Cyrus the Persian, he deliberately accorded kindly treat-

ment to subject nationalities. Hitherto many of these had been the victims of extortion by unscrupulous officials. The latter had no longer a free hand ; they had to render an account of their stewardship to Cæsar. The Gospels themselves contain evidence that this formed a very effectual check upon maladministration (Jn 19<sup>12</sup>). Augustus was shrewd enough to perceive that harsh treatment of conquered nations was a source of weakness to the State because fitted to foster disaffection. It was therefore part of his settled policy to establish Roman rule with the least possible derangement of local customs and religious practices. He thus wisely avoided the mistake committed in Judæa by the Syrian king Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, whose insane measures of repression led to the spirited revolt under the Maccabees.

Although Augustus was less liberal than Julius Cæsar had been in granting admission to the Roman franchise, his successors reverted to the policy of spreading the benefits of Roman citizenship with a view to the transformation of mere national feeling into the larger pride of empire. And the achievements of Rome, the vastness of her dominion, and the security from invasion and petty feuds offered by her overlordship, constituted an attraction too strong in most cases to be resisted. In Egypt and Judæa, it is true, these considerations failed to undermine national sentiment ; but these exceptions only prove the rule. If here and there there was a patriotism that was invincible, yet even in presence of all conflicting elements the unification of the world was being effected upon a scale hitherto unprecedented. Facility of international communication was secured not only by the opening up of safe routes, but by the wide diffusion of the classical tongues. Latin was a passport to all the West, and Greek to all the East. Greek soon came to be familiar in educated circles even in the West. But community of language implies to a large extent community of thought and sentiment.

National barriers were accordingly broken down, and throughout the whole Mediterranean region a new type of civilization arose. It was the combined product of Greek ideas, Roman character, and Oriental influences, although the last named were as yet inconsiderable.

#### 6. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY UNDER THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT

The outward and political unity into which the nations were now fused by the material power of Rome was but the consolidation of a deeper unity already to a large extent effected through Alexander's policy of Hellenizing the world. Interchange of spiritual thought and feeling had paved the way for external confederation. In the words of the illustrious Origen, "God prepared the nations for the teaching of Jesus by causing the Roman Emperor to rule over all the world; there was no longer to be a plurality of kingdoms, else would the nations have been strangers to one another, and so the apostles would have found it harder to carry out the task laid on them by Jesus when He said, 'Go and teach all nations.' It is well known that the birth of Jesus took place in the reign of Augustus, who fused and federated the numerous peoples upon earth into a single empire."<sup>1</sup> In this external unity, built up slowly by force of arms, legal enactment, enterprise, industry, and devotion to duty, there was not only much that was in itself strong and worthy—it was also a preparation for Christianity. From this standpoint it deserves to rank along with the opportune spread of the Greek language. As a kingdom of this world, however, the Roman Empire could not create the unity achieved through the gospel. It stood for devotion to a code, not to a Person. But in the providence of God it constructed the framework which awaited the vitalizing breath of Christian truth. A second element in the positive preparation for Chris-

<sup>1</sup> *c. Cels.* ii. 30.

tianity under the Roman government was the development of the idea of citizenship with its implied privileges on the one hand, and its implied duty towards the body politic on the other. At any acute crisis the consuls were invested with dictatorial power, *ne quid respublica detrimenti capiat*.

Then none was for a party ;  
Then all were for the State.

Still another important factor in this connexion was the already noted provision of improved means of communication between different parts of the world. The new facilities for trade and safe travel by land and sea opened up a path for the spread of the gospel throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire. From the Acts of the Apostles it is clear to what an extent early missionary activity was expedited by the fact that civilization had become cosmopolitan.

But in the state of the ancient world at the time there was a negative as well as a positive preparation for the religion of Christ. To the picture of Roman rule there is another side than that already mentioned. Strength became a reign of force, law an instrument of tyranny, and duty a mere performance of obligations to the State. There was no perception of the truth that

It is excellent

To have a giant's strength ; but it is tyrannous  
To use it like a giant.

Rome's advancing greatness was secured at a vast cost of blood and tears. Justice and humanity were sacrificed at the shrine of martial and political glory. In the last century of the Republic, after the social and civil wars, extreme wretchedness prevailed in Italy itself as well as in the various lands which had been ravaged by cruel conflicts. Destructive armies were followed by rapacious governors and extortionate officials. The extant ruins of her public works are monuments to the pitiless tyranny

by means of which Rome's dominion was established, and to the widespread suffering which its growing prosperity entailed. Some of them, like the amphitheatres, were at once the product of forced labour and the fixed habitations of cruelty. For two centuries the gladiatorial contests at the public games had been exercising a very brutalizing influence and destroying all sense of the sacredness of human life. The consul Flaminius had a Boian chief killed merely to shew a favourite boy the sight of a man in the agony of death. In the stormy days amid which the Republic ceased to exist, anarchy and bloodshed increased until, in B.C. 29, two years after the battle of Actium, Octavian closed the Temple of Janus, renounced the policy of further aggression, and declared that "Rome must not enlarge the borders of her empire." A world weary of war and its horrors was about to experience a welcome change of government. The conqueror of Antony and the heir of Cæsar was called to establish the new régime which took the form "neither of a kingdom nor of a dictatorship, but of a republic constituted in the name of a chief" (Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 9).

The spirit of Rome appears further in the stern rigour which governed domestic life. Discipline degenerated into despotism. Among the Romans the family had attained a well-defined character as the central fact in the social organism. The State was conceived as simply the aggregate of the families belonging to it. This conception pervaded all civic institution. The aristocracy were known as the Patricians or *Fathers*, and the parliament or senate as the *Conscript Fathers*. When a Roman went forth to battle he had always in view the protection of hearth and home. This was his watchword, and it embodied all that was most sacred to him. The ashes of his fathers were as dear to him as the temples of his gods; they *were* indeed his gods, the Lares and Penates at whose shrine

his household worshipped. This reverence for his ancestors was the most deeply rooted principle in the Roman heart, the most powerful factor in Roman life, and the most effective cincture of the Roman State. Any attempt to interfere with the institution of the family would have called forth determined opposition. But in the home the father ruled, or could rule, as with a rod of iron. So utterly were his wife and children in subjection to him that they were virtually his slaves. The law allowed them to possess no property of their own; whatever they earned was his. Even the power of life and death was put into his hands. Now this intensely rigorous form of family life did bear some good fruits. Those brought up under it learned for one thing to *obey*; their faculty of reverence was grandly developed; while sins against chastity were for long practically unknown. But the system had also its drawbacks, and very serious these were. That tenderness of the human heart by which we live could not grow on such a soil. We live not only by admiration, but also by love and hope,<sup>1</sup> and it was the vice of this system that, while it nobly fostered respect for law and order, it interfered with the free expansion of the human spirit. It is only in the warm freedom of the summer air that the flowers reach perfection, and it is not otherwise with the soul of man. Destroy its freedom, and you stunt its growth. The policy of "blood and iron" is always ruinous in the end, alike for the family and for the State. A point is reached when repression is no longer possible, and men burst the bands by which they have been held. So it was at least in ancient Rome. Still another phase of the same tendency is met with in the sphere of religion, which was dominated by the civil power and became a mere matter of ceremonial. This aspect of Roman imperialism, however, will be dealt with later.

<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth, *The Excursion*, Bk. iv.

7. SOCIAL LIFE AND ETHICS IN THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD <sup>1</sup>

In the Roman Empire democracy asserted itself as in Greece, but in the hands of the Senate so-called representative government became a fiasco. The real power was monopolized by military officials who, while chattering about the will of the people, ruled with despotic sway and with an eye to their own aggrandizement. The exhaustion which had overtaken Greece as a result of incessant wars was reproduced in the experience of Rome herself as well as in that of the countries she had vanquished. A spirit of restlessness bordering upon anarchy broke out, civil administration was weakened, and militarism grew apace until it became the dominant power in the State. Meanwhile fertile lands lay desolated, and many cities were crushed under a load of debt. A widespread disposition to play the game of grab; vicious propensities fed from the spoils of lands conquered in the East; fierce class hatred between the rich and the proletariat; luxurious extravagance on the part of the wealthy;<sup>2</sup> the diffusion of idleness among a population largely supported by doles of corn, wine, and oil; a mania for pleasure—all tended to undermine the strength of the old Roman character and to create a situation fatal to true prosperity. Under the new conditions the strenuous spirit developed in the struggle with difficulties decayed, and the people who had borne themselves so bravely in face of hardship and danger succumbed to the temptation

<sup>1</sup> On the *Greek* aspect of this subject the reader is referred to the chapter on "Social Life in the Hellenistic World" in a previous sketch by the present writer. See *Jesus and the Greeks*, Part i. ch. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Friedländer, however, in his fascinating work on *Roman Life and Manners* (vol. ii.) conclusively shews that as regards food, dress, dwelling-houses, domestic arrangements, etc., the standard of luxury among the Romans was really lower than that of the modern world. It is clearly precarious to form a judgment on the manners of Rome from the extravagances of Caligula and Nero.



of a surging materialism. They lacked the wisdom and the skill to carry a full cup. A further element in the case was of a constitutional nature. Through a coalition of the *bourgeoisie* and the proletariat the aristocratic rule of the senatorial and equestrian orders was upset, and although under the Julii and Claudii they attempted to retrieve their position, the effort failed. A recurrence of civil war proved the strength of the new form of government, to which the middle class in urban areas throughout the empire lent their support on the basis of municipal autonomy. But the municipal *bourgeoisie* shewed itself as unwilling as were the imperial aristocrats to assimilate the lower orders, and in consequence a sharp antagonism ensued between them and the masses. This developed into a kind of duel between the country and the cities, the peasants and the artisans. Ultimately, in the third century A.D., the proletariat prevailed, the middle and upper classes went under, and there was inaugurated a despotic régime upheld by the peasants and the army. Long ere this, however, by extensive elimination of the middle classes, particularly during the wars of Alexander's successors, the world had already largely deprived itself of one of the best assets of any country. This disastrous policy was carried to completion by the Romans on their gaining supremacy in the East, while in Italy itself it was likewise promoted by frequent, and latterly in large part civil and social, wars. Many problems arose which but for the ill-advised suppression of the middle class—"the economic backbone of the State"—would have been easier of solution. Owing to this mistaken course, Greeks and Romans alike were left without the one hopeful means of securing the triumph of reason, and of reconciling the warring extremists who disturbed the peace of the civilized world. But the worst has still to be mentioned: the nation was fast drifting into moral and spiritual bankruptcy.

In estimating the condition of things in the Roman world at the Advent of Christ it is difficult to avoid falling into one-sided exaggeration. If we look merely to the moral principles expressed by philosophers like Seneca or writers like Plutarch, without inquiring as to the extent to which those principles were applied, we shall certainly overrate the merits of the ancient faiths, and take too favourable a view of the actual situation. On the other hand, if we look merely at the picture drawn for us by Juvenal and Tacitus, we shall be apt to conclude that everything worthy had died out of pagan society; but this, too, would be to misunderstand the nature of the case. In his Second Apology, Justin bears witness to the admirable moral teaching of the Stoics, some of whom suffered martyrdom because of their virtuous lives; and among the common people throughout the empire there were doubtless many who had neither part nor lot in the ridiculous dainties or bestial practices of the wanton revellers pilloried in the literature of the age.

It was in the capital itself, and in the pleasure resorts of the period, that the influence of Eastern manners told most perniciously upon the national character. The sudden acquisition of wealth proved demoralizing to a people who had small appreciation for art or literature. With rare exceptions, they copied only the vices of the Greeks. The old frugal, industrious, and virtuous manner of life practised by their ancestors was in too many instances exchanged for an idle, luxurious, and sensual existence. At one time no kind of slave was so cheap, now none was so valuable, as a cook. Hand in hand with increasing wealth and outward prosperity came indolence and corruption, and the State whose citizens could boast that for five centuries no Roman had ever to divorce his wife, sank under the emperors to the pitch of moral degradation mirrored in the Satires of Juvenal and in the opening chapter of Paul's epistle. The

fountains of life were poisoned. Although the position of women in Rome was for long a much more dignified one than in Greece, there was latterly a greatly diminished value set upon marriage, a marked increase of divorces, and a general casting off of moral restraint. In the last pre-Christian century almost every vice was rampant—immorality and paiderastia, abortion and infanticide, gluttony and avarice, cruelty and sycophancy, gambling and suicide, indecency in pictures, at public races, and on the stage. Cato and others were so horrified at the nameless vices practised by the adherents of the newly introduced worship of Bacchus (B.C. 181) that after strict investigation held, the cult was declared illegal in Italy, and the worst offenders were put to death. No general protest, however, was made against the abominations that were so rife. And the indifference of the many, as well as the licence of the offenders, must both be traced to the same source, namely, the sinking of the worth of manhood in the exaggerated idea of citizenship which obtained throughout the classical world.

Two important factors in the situation were the growing prevalence of slavery and the passion for amusements.

Of all institutions in the ancient world slavery was one of the most outstanding, and formed part and parcel of corporate social life. Among Greeks and Romans, as also among the Jews, no moral turpitude attached to the possession of slaves. Nor indeed, viewed as a necessary adjunct of domestic life, could slavery have been eradicated all at once without plunging the world into chaos—a fact recognized by the early Christian Church, which was content to tolerate it on principles which pointed to its ultimate abolition.<sup>1</sup>

Outside of Athens, the lot of a slave in Greece was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, 10-16. The Apostle's request to his friend reveals an entirely different attitude to the runaway slave from the severity with which such cases were usually treated.

pitiable, and even in the Roman Republic, if not quite so miserable, was cruelly hard. Brutal mutilation was often inflicted for paltry offences. Even Roman dames behaved ferociously to bondwomen on the slightest pretexts. Tacitus states that when the prefect Pedonius was killed by one of his slaves this was avenged by the execution of the whole 400 slaves belonging to the family.<sup>1</sup> Yet, after all, these enormities scarcely surpassed the African slavery abuses of eighteenth-century Europe and nineteenth-century America.

In many instances the number of slaves—recruited mainly from war, but also from piracy, highway robbery, bankruptcy, and breeding of bondmen for the market—exceeded that of freemen. A census at Athens in B.C. 317 shewed that for every freeman there were twenty slaves. On the annexation of Sardinia by the Romans in the Punic wars of the succeeding century, so extensive was the sale of captives as to give rise to the proverb *Sardi venales*: “as cheap as Sardinians.” No fewer than 53,000 Gauls were sold by Cæsar on the spot,<sup>2</sup> and on the Ancyra monument Augustus records that he handed over 30,000 for execution. In Rome there were private domiciles where slaves were counted by thousands. A century and a half before the Christian era the number of slaves sold in the daily market at Delos totalled 10,000. At the Advent of Christ the slave population in the city of Rome is reckoned by the antiquarian, C. G. Zumpt, at fully 550,000, but this is only a conjecture. To say that there were at least as many slaves as free, would, however, probably be to understate the case.

But for the fact that the enormous Roman slave population was mostly employed in the multifarious service of wealthy families, it must have swamped free labour, both skilled and unskilled, in the cities altogether. As it was, it did tend to reduce employment and wages,

<sup>1</sup> *Hist.* xiv. 42.

<sup>2</sup> *B.G.* ii. 33.

while at the same time the association of work in general with servility helped to bring it into disrepute. Although farming was carried on mostly by slave labour the slaves being sometimes, as in the *latifundia* (hill farms) of southern Italy, kept in chains and treated like beasts, the services of freemen were also in demand at certain seasons, particularly during harvest and vintage.

Legally, a slave had no personal rights; he was merely the chattel of his master, who might torture or kill him at will. Yet by good behaviour he might gain his freedom and become a Roman citizen. For want of proper regulation, however, the emancipation of slaves, when practised on a large scale, was fraught with considerable danger to the state. Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives a graphic description of the evil consequences of such indiscriminate introduction into the body politic of alien blood, and condemns the conferring of citizenship upon a "crowd of villains and criminals."<sup>1</sup>

More serious than either its economic or legal aspects were the moral effects of slavery, alike upon the slaves and upon their masters. Many of the slaves were culturally and consciously superior to those who lorded it over them. Torn from home and kindred, placed amid strange surroundings tantamount to the obliteration of every custom, social, juridical, and religious, of their former life, and deprived of all moral discretion, they had only one course open to them—that of implicit obedience. Anything, however revolting, had to be done at the master's call.<sup>2</sup> Actuated solely by fear of punishment, they soon learned to abet his vices, and even to invent some new ones for him. Before the end of the Republican period the cancer of immorality had spread within Roman homes with disastrous effects,

<sup>1</sup> *Ant. Rom.* iv. 24.

<sup>2</sup> "Nec turpe est quod dominus jubet," Petronius, *Sat.* 75.

primarily upon the upbringing of the young, and ultimately upon the very destiny of the Roman State. In the case of slave-owners themselves the practice of arbitrary despotism tended to destroy the natural instinct of justice, and induced an atrophy of the moral sense which rendered them indifferent to human misery. A slave's suffering, or even his life, was nothing to them. "The ordinary callousness of human nature," says Dr. Warde Fowler, "had, under the baleful influence of slavery, become absolute blindness, nor were men's eyes to be opened until Christianity began to leaven the world with the doctrine of universal love."<sup>1</sup> Is the learned author too severe in suggesting a comparison in this respect with the average plutocrat of to-day in his attitude towards the distressed masses of our urban population?

Naturally the craze for amusements related not so much to the rude fun of the simple open-air pastimes in rural districts as to the position in provincial towns, and especially in the capital city, where there was a keen demand for bread and races (*panem et circenses*). This sport-loving spirit is clearly reflected in the NT Epistles: (1 Co 9<sup>24ff.</sup>; Ph 3<sup>14f.</sup>; 1 Tim 6<sup>12</sup>; 2 Tim 2<sup>5</sup>; Heb 12<sup>1</sup>). The excitement aroused by spectacular shows was not unlike that called forth in our times by a great football match, but with this difference that Roman spectacles were provided gratuitously.<sup>2</sup> Not only so; spectators were lavishly entertained, food and drink being supplied, together with choice fruits and a liberal distribution of tickets for substantial prizes. To meet the heavy cost thus entailed, the State provision had latterly to be supplemented by private subscriptions, the

<sup>1</sup> *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, p. 236.

<sup>2</sup> "An Englishman may find some difficulty at first in realizing this; it is as if cricket and football matches and theatres in London were open to the public gratis, and the cost provided by the London County Council."—W. Warde Fowler, *op. cit.* p. 298.

burden falling chiefly upon candidates for the magistracy. The ædiles in charge had often to borrow, and even as in the case of Scaurus to face bankruptcy, in order to raise the necessary funds. In B.C. 150 thirty talents (£7050) sufficed, but in the later days of the Republic and under the Empire the outlays were much larger, and in a sense compulsory. While comparatively indifferent about political rights, the proletariat under Tiberius "insisted on their right, acquired during the civil war, to be fed and amused by the government."<sup>1</sup> The emperors on their part considered it a wise policy to keep the populace in good humour by treating them to extra shows and special gifts of money and goods. In the time of Augustus sixty-six days were devoted to the festivals, but under Tiberius the number rose to eighty-seven, and afterwards to about a hundred. All alike were obsessed by the games. Nobles, emperors, and even women of high station were swept into the service of the arena, and the mob was charmed to see them debasing themselves to provide a holiday amusement such as they loved.<sup>2</sup> On such occasions multitudes of strangers thronged to Rome to share in the universal mania, and as the spectacles were splendidly illuminated and prolonged throughout the night, disorderly scenes were not infrequent.

Originally the *Feriae*<sup>3</sup> (Lupercalia, Saturnalia, etc.) had a certain religious significance, but were gradually supplanted by the *Ludi*, which were practically "school-boy holidays." Although athletic contests (*agones*) were borrowed from Greece, the Romans preferred the circus and wild-beast shows. To meet the last-named craving, the whole Mediterranean region was largely

<sup>1</sup> Rostootzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* viii. : "Under an emperor who plays the cithara in public, a noble comedian may be expected. The next stage is the gladiators' school."

<sup>3</sup> The name is still preserved in our word *fair*.

depleted of wild animals.<sup>1</sup> The dramatic element also made its appeal, but at the end of the Republican period shewed distinct signs of deterioration. The stage was largely given over to comic farces modelled after the new Athenian comedy, with its representations of low life and its vulgar witticisms. Political allusions in the plays drew forth applause or disapproval from the audience. More and more the real drama was ousted by pantomimes, music, and dancing. For the Roman populace, however, the chief attraction lay in the arena. An insatiable thirst for its orgies of blood and cruelty—in which men fought with men or with beasts and savage animals tore each other to pieces—was developed, and took hold even upon high-born women. A school of gladiators, recruited mostly from captives,<sup>2</sup> slaves, and criminals,<sup>3</sup> but including many volunteers, assumed such proportions, and received such patronage as to constitute a menace to the peace of society, while the demoralizing influence of the brutal gladiatorial exhibitions of the arena upon the whole body of the infatuated people became more and more pronounced. Under the Empire many Christians were forced to fight in the amphitheatre for the entertainment of the mob. The ruins of the Colosseum still mark the scene where they proved their faithfulness unto death.

<sup>1</sup> Cicero (*ad Fam.* viii. 9) tells how Cæcilius Rufus, the orator, pestered him to send him a supply of panthers from Cilicia for exhibition at the games. He was told in reply that "there were no panthers in Cilicia, for they had all fled to Caria, in anger that in so general a peace they had become the sole objects of attack!" The story is mentioned by Plutarch in his *Life* of Cicero.

<sup>2</sup> In A.D. 44 Claudius thus disposed of captured Britons, and after the fall of Jerusalem Titus sent many Jewish prisoners into the provinces to become the prey of gladiators or wild beasts.

<sup>3</sup> The Jewish Herod Agrippa I. massed the whole of the 1400 condemned criminals of his kingdom at Berytus, and caused them to fight in the amphitheatre there.



## 8. THE ROMAN DOMINION IN JUDÆA

As the rise of Christianity is indelibly associated with Palestinian soil, the contemporaneous Roman rule in Judæa naturally calls for special attention.

(1) *The Occasion of Rome's Intervention*

The first direct interference of Rome in Judæan affairs was brought about by the appeal of the two rivals for the succession to the Hasmonæan throne. On the death of Alexandra, wife of Jannæus, in B.C. 69, her two sons, Hyrcanus (already anointed High-Priest) and Aristobulus, began a fratricidal war for supremacy. At Jericho they met in a pitched battle in which Aristobulus was victorious. Hyrcanus took refuge in the Baris, but eventually an understanding was reached whereby Aristobulus was to rule and Hyrcanus to retain his fortune unmolested. This agreement between the brothers might have endured but for the discontent of Antipater, an Idumæan, who had espoused the cause of Hyrcanus, foreseeing that he could assert himself better under him than under the fierce and passionate Aristobulus. He easily persuaded Hyrcanus to go back on the agreement, and having fled from Jerusalem to Petra, bribed Aretas, king of the Nabatæans, to aid them, by the promise of the restoration of the twelve cities Jannæus had taken from him. Aretas accordingly invaded Judæa, conquered Aristobulus in battle, and besieged him in Jerusalem. Meanwhile Pompey was campaigning in Syria, and both factions appealed to Scaurus, his general in Damascus, for aid. As both offered him bribes, he declared for Aristobulus, who seemed the more likely to pay. Although in deference to Rome, Aretas withdrew his forces, he was disastrously defeated by Aristobulus on his homeward march. But Scaurus was merely Pompey's lieutenant, and on the arrival of the latter in Damascus, both parties sent

embassies to him, as also did the Jewish people, who asked for the restoration of the old theocracy. Pompey marched into Judæa, in order to have the country in his hands before deciding. Aristobulus foolishly fled, but daunted by Pompey's resolute pursuit, repaired to the Roman general's camp to offer him rich presents. Pompey detained Aristobulus and sent Gabinius to take possession of Jerusalem. He, however, found the gates shut against him and returned. Pompey, enraged, imprisoned Aristobulus and advanced against the city. The adherents of Hyrcanus succeeded in opening the gates to him, whereupon the other party retired to the Temple Mount, the strongest point in Jerusalem. There they sustained for three months a regular siege. At length, taking advantage of the Sabbath to erect siege-engines, the Romans carried the place by assault and massacred all within, even to the priests at the altar (B.C. 63). Though the treasures of the Temple were left intact, Pompey sacrilegiously entered the Holy of Holies. He also imposed a tribute on the country and took many important cities and districts from the Jewish territory, placing them under the governor of Syria. Hyrcanus II. was named High-Priest and Ethnarch of his contracted country, and Pompey took Aristobulus to Rome to grace his triumph as a captive. Thus ended the freedom of the Jewish people, for though Judæa was not yet a Roman province, its rulers were vassals to Rome, and trembled at her nod.

(2) *The Course of Events under Hyrcanus II.*

(B.C. 63-40)

Judæa, however, was not subdued. In B.C. 57 Alexander, son of Aristobulus, had escaped on the way to Rome, and raising the people in the north, surprised Jerusalem and was about to begin repairing the walls when Gabinius came against him. He retreated to Alexandrium, and perceiving his cause hopeless, sur-

rendered. Gabinius, hoping by decentralization to break up the unity of the Jews, divided Judæa into five districts (probably judicial), with centres at Jerusalem, Gadara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sepphoris (Galilee). Hyrcanus was left with his purely spiritual office of high-priest. Shortly afterwards, in B.C. 56, the country was again in revolt, Aristobulus and Antigonus his son having escaped from Rome. They were soon defeated, however, and again sent prisoners to Italy. Next year, Gabinius being on an expedition to Egypt, Alexander raised a fresh rebellion and massacred a number of Romans on Mount Gerizim, but was defeated with great slaughter shortly afterwards. Crassus, the Triumvir, as Proconsul of Syria did little to lessen the bitter feelings of the Jews to Rome when, merely passing through Jerusalem, and on no punitive expedition, he robbed the Temple treasury of ten thousand talents. Judæa continued in a state of spasmodic revolt until in B.C. 49 the Roman Civil War began. The defeat and death of Pompey at Pharsalia in B.C. 48 rendered matters perilous for the Idumæan, who had zealously curried favour with him. However, he and Hyrcanus immediately attached themselves to Cæsar's party. By sending a large body of troops to Cæsar's aid, and by stimulating Arab and Syrian princes to help him, Antipater contributed much to the great general's success in Egypt, and thus rendered futile the application of Antigonus to take possession of the estate of Aristobulus. To Antipater were also due certain concessions granted by Cæsar to the Jews, including immunity from all military service. Hyrcanus, who had been installed as "Ethnarch," was a mere figure-head. Antipater, who had played for his own hand, was virtually king. He appointed Phasael, his eldest son, governor of Jerusalem, and Herod, his second, governor of Galilee. With the former we need not much concern ourselves, but the latter, who was to be Herod the Great,

must command our interest. One of his earliest acts of governorship was his capture and summary execution of the robber-chief Hezekiah. Now this was a usurpation of the power of the Sanhedrin, to whom alone belonged the right to inflict the penalty of death. Summoned to appear before them, he did so defiantly, and nearly secured his acquittal. When, however, this court had been reminded by Shammai the Scribe of their dignity and duty, he was warned by Hyrcanus and withdrew to Galilee before sentence was pronounced.

In B.C. 44 Cæsar was assassinated. Antipater, whose friendship was given only to those in power, immediately sought to gain the goodwill of the conspirators. Cassius demanded from Judæa 700 talents, which were forthcoming, though the inhabitants of four towns were sold as slaves for failure to contribute their quota. Herod, particularly, won the regard of Cassius by the promptitude with which he produced his share. In B.C. 43 Antipater was murdered by a certain Malichus whom he had constantly befriended, but who aspired to succeed to Antipater's influence in Judæa. Herod, however, speedily avenged his father, Malichus being murdered through his instigation at Tyre.

More important to Herod's ambitious schemes were the fortunes of the warring parties of Rome. Antony and Octavian in B.C. 42 defeated Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, and Antony thereby became master of Roman Asia. As usual, the Jewish parties sent their deputations to wait upon the conqueror and to urge their respective claims. The Pharisaic party tendered complaints against Herod and Phasaël, but Antony, who had served under Gabinius, and remembered his friendship with Antipater, would not hear them. He reversed the decrees of Cassius, and appointed Herod and Phasaël tetrarchs.

(3) *King Antigonus, the last occupant of the Hasmonæan Throne* (B.C. 40-37)

Antony quitted Syria in B.C. 40, and the Parthians took advantage of his absence to invade the province. Antigonus, by means of great promises, induced Pacorus their prince, and Barzaphernes their general, to aid him in securing possession of his throne. As a result, the two brothers were completely overwhelmed, Phasael being taken prisoner along with Hyrcanus, but Herod succeeding in escaping to Petra. Hyrcanus had his ears cut off in order to disqualify him from the high-priesthood; Phasael anticipated his captors by destroying himself; and Antigonus, assuming the office of high-priest under his Hebrew name of Mattathias, was also declared king.

Herod's main objective now was to reach Rome. In spite of unfavourable weather he did so, and by the goodwill of Antony and Octavian was declared by the Senate king of Judæa. From appointment he had now to proceed to possession. In B.C. 39 he landed at Ptolemais and collected an army, but the Roman governor of Syria, Ventidius, though ordered by Antony to aid him, was very slow in doing so, probably having been bribed by Antigonus. Next year Ventidius had to renew hostilities with the Parthians, and even without the Roman troops Herod made considerable progress in subduing the country. But as often as he left one district for another the revolt broke out anew, and at last, hearing that Antony had arrived in Syria, he determined to hasten to him and appeal personally for aid. Two legions under Sosius were sent to his assistance. Before winter made further campaigning impossible, he had made himself master of all the country except Jerusalem. So sure was he of victory that he now married his betrothed Mariamme, granddaughter of Hyrcanus. In fifty-five days the lower part of the

city and the outer temple were taken, and soon the upper city and inner court were carried by assault and the garrison slaughtered. Antigonus was taken captive to Antioch and executed at Herod's request.

- (4) *The Herods as Vassal-Kings* (B.C. 37–A.D. 41):  
*Archelaus as Ethnarch* (B.C. 4–A.D. 6)

(a) *Herod the Great* (B.C. 37–4)

Though now master of his kingdom through the aid of Rome, Herod knew that he had little support from his people. His first task, therefore, was to consolidate his position. While he could rely on the support of Rome, he could victimize and terrorize his subjects and laugh at their attempts at revolt. He perceived that all members of the Hasmonæan family were his natural enemies, and that they would be the rallying-point for any insurrection. Therefore, although his wife was the granddaughter of Hyrcanus II., he regarded the whole family with suspicion and distrust. Finding Herod's constant espionage intolerable, Alexandra, his mother-in-law, planned to escape with her son Aristobulus III. to Cleopatra. The plot having been betrayed to Herod, he contrived to have the youth drowned, seemingly accidentally, while bathing (B.C. 35). Through Cleopatra, he was summoned before Antony to clear himself of the charge of murdering Aristobulus. This he easily did, not going empty-handed. Before his departure to face Antony, he had given to his brother-in-law Joseph orders that in case he did not return, Mariamme should be put to death. When he came back he was enraged to find that Joseph had divulged his secret. Salome, his sister, and of a similar disposition to his own, fanned his rage, and Joseph was executed, and Alexandra imprisoned. Cleopatra's enmity to Herod became apparent when she persuaded Antony to transfer to her Phœnicia, part of the Arabian territory, and the fertile district of

Jericho. Herod, perforce, had to submit with good grace, and lease his own lands from Cleopatra.

Then came the struggle between Antony and Octavian. Herod wished to support Antony with all his power, but was ordered at Cleopatra's instigation to fight against Malchus, the Arabian king. Her object was, of course, to weaken both Herod and Malchus. In the struggle which ensued, Herod was eventually victorious. Actium, with the defeat of Antony, seemed to all to presage Herod's downfall, but, a true son of his father, he set out to meet the conqueror, Octavian. With his usual plausibility he won over Augustus, who recognized him as king, and restored to him not only the territories which Antony had compelled him to cede to Cleopatra, but Samaria also.

Before his departure to Rhodes to visit Augustus, Herod had contrived to have the aged Hyrcanus put to death on a charge of conspiring with the Arabian king, Malchus. He thus removed one whom he thought might be the soul of a general rising in his absence. On his return to Jerusalem, rejoicing in his dexterity in placing the external affairs of his kingdom on such a firm basis, his suspicious nature drove him once more to steep his hands in the blood of his own family. Again he had given secret commands for the destruction of Mariamme in case of his non-return, and again the secret had been betrayed. Soemus, the defaulter, was summarily executed, and Mariamme, accused of infidelity, and after a show of judicial procedure, was also put to death. Overcome with remorse, he fell dangerously ill, for he passionately loved Mariamme, and it was only a fierce jealousy which had adjudged her to die. In the expectation of his early dissolution Alexandra began to scheme to secure the throne for herself, or at least for Mariamme's sons. This information, communicated to Herod, roused him from his sickly lethargy, and in B.C. 28 Alexandra was led to the block. Among others who suffered the same

fate about this time was his brother-in-law, Costobar, Salome's second husband.

Recovered from his illness, firmly seated on his throne, and having removed the last of the Hasmonaeans, Herod felt himself secure. He now began to indulge his favourite inclinations. The record of his building achievements, during some twelve years only, is almost unbelievable. Cities, harbours, palaces, theatres, fortresses, aqueducts, and other public works transformed the face of the country. Perhaps his greatest achievements in this line were the construction of the harbour and city of Cæsarea, and the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. The harbour at Cæsarea was an immense work, involving the construction of two moles, or breakwaters, far out to sea, and was of great benefit commercially. His reconstruction of the Temple was not undertaken from any zeal for religion it represented, but chiefly from a desire for glory as a rival of Solomon, and from the hope that he would thereby secure the gratitude of the Jews. As soon as Herod's plans were announced the suspicions of the priesthood were aroused, and he had to proceed with great circumspection. After the preliminary works were completed, the rest of the operations were undertaken by priests, so that all was done according to the requirements of the Law, the Temple proper being completed in a year and a half after its commencement in B.C. 20. Besides his great building achievements, Herod could point to his distributions of food and clothing during the great famine of B.C. 25-24, to his remission of a third of the taxes thereafter, to his measures for the welfare of the Jews throughout the world, and to the increased prestige of Jews and the Jewish religion in all parts of the Roman Empire. Such benefits made his rule, if not popular, at least tolerable, to many, but the majority, led by the Pharisees, remained sullenly hostile.

The success of Herod's reign depended entirely on his



relationship with Rome. He was a *rex socius* or vassal-king. His title was granted by Rome, and was not hereditary. His territory might be reduced and an inferior title given him, or he might be set aside altogether, either in favour of another or of Rome herself. A vassal-king could not levy war or conclude treaties without the Emperor's sanction: he was under obligation to raise auxiliary troops for the service of the Empire, and contributions of money were demanded on special occasions. Thus the dependent kings were sovereign in their own territories only. They had unlimited power over their own subjects, controlled their own armies, imposed taxes, and administered the revenues as they pleased.

Herod did all in his power to strengthen his position with the Emperor. He missed no opportunity of presenting himself before Augustus and paying his respects with due protestations of devotion. He sent his sons Alexander and Aristobulus to Rome to be educated, and was on terms of intimate friendship with Agrippa, the Emperor's son-in-law. That these attentions and friendships were not fruitless may be seen in the considerable grants of new territory bestowed on him from time to time.

The darkest part of Herod's reign was now at hand, darkened not so much by external or internal affairs as by the shadow of his murdered wife, Mariamme. In B.C. 17 Herod had brought back from Rome her two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, to live at the court in Jerusalem. They were soon married, Alexander to Glaphyra, daughter of Archilaus, king of Cappadocia, and Aristobulus to Berenice, daughter of Herod's sister, Salome. For a while all went well, until Salome began to sow the seeds of suspicion within the heart of Herod. She pointed out that the two youths, who on their mother's side were Hasmonaeans, would be a rallying-point for the Jews against him. Further, his own evil conscience obliged him to suspect that they would naturally desire

to avenge the murder of their mother. To counter-balance any hopes the brothers might entertain of benefiting by his removal, Herod hit upon a most unfortunate expedient. He had an elder son Antipater, by a common woman, Doris, whom he had put away on his marriage with Mariamme. Recalling them to court, he made Antipater a sort of spy over his stepbrothers. His sole motive in life was, by constantly throwing suspicion on the two brothers, to ensure the succession of the throne to himself. The increased suspicions of Herod, and the supervision to which they were subjected, naturally augmented the aversion of Alexander and Aristobulus to their father. Things came to such a pass that he decided to accuse his two sons before the Emperor. In B.C. 12 the three appeared before Augustus, who, seeing the absurdity of Herod's charges, dismissed them, apparently reconciled. On their return Herod announced that he had designated his *three* eldest sons as his successors in the order of their ages. Antipater now renewed his intrigues, ably backed by Pheroras and Salome, who as Idumæans loathed the Hasmonæan blood in Alexander and Aristobulus. Herod could not see why they should not murder him as he had murdered their mother, and employed all means, from continuous spying to torturing their friends, to find proof of their guilty designs. On some flimsy pretext he cast Alexander into prison, but Archilaus, the youth's father-in-law, intervened and had him set free. The final blow to any hopes the brothers might have was delivered by a worthless parasite of a Greek, Eurycles, who, worming himself into the confidence of Alexander, tempted him to let slip some ill-humoured words against his father. These were reported to Antipater and by him to Herod. Alexander and Aristobulus were immediately imprisoned, and their father accused them to Augustus of treasonable designs. The Emperor gave him leave to punish them as he thought best, but advised him to hold a court of arbitra-

tion, consisting of Roman officials and his own friends. The court, which was allowed to hear only Herod's accusations and witnesses, decided on a sentence of death. Three hundred persons accused of complicity were stoned to death, and they themselves were strangled in Samaria, where thirty years before Herod had married Mariamme (B.C. 7).

But there was to be no peace in the household of Herod. Now more than ever did Antipater desire to be rid of him, as did most of his relatives. Some plot between Antipater and Pheroras was discovered, but only resulted in Pheroras being sent to his tetrarchy across the Jordan, while Antipater found it advisable to visit Rome. Then Pheroras died. Herod received a hint that the circumstances of his death were suspicious, and it came out that he had received poison from Antipater intended for Herod. Torture revealed further proofs of Antipater's guilt, and involved many persons in the plot. Herod at once sent to Rome for Antipater, but his message was couched in terms which could arouse no suspicion in the breast of his treacherous son. On his arrival he was thrown into prison, and the whole affair placed before the Emperor. Meanwhile Herod fell sick of an incurable disease, and as he was already seventy years of age it was clear that his days were numbered. A report of his death got abroad, and a popular tumult broke out; the mob tore down the great golden eagle which Herod out of flattery to Rome had set over the Temple gate. Two rabbis, Judas and Mattathias, were the instigators of this riot, and even on his deathbed Herod condemned them to death. They and several associates were burnt alive at Jericho. Knowing that there would be general rejoicing at his death, the old tyrant had the most distinguished men of the nation shut up in the hippodrome at Jericho, and made Salome and her husband swear to have them all cut down before the news of his demise was made public, so that there

would be a general mourning. A favourable reply from Rome in connexion with the affair of Antipater gave him the opportunity of signing his eldest son's death-warrant and of altering his will. He now nominated as king Archelaus, his elder son by the Samaritan Malthace, while Antipas, son of the same mother, was to be tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and Philip, son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem, tetrarch of the north-eastern provinces. Five days after the execution of Antipater, Herod died at Jericho (B.C. 4).

(b) *The Sons of Herod.*

(i) *Philip* (B.C. 4–A.D. 34).—By Herod's will Philip was allotted the northern region to the east of the Jordan, together with the district of Panias (Cæsarea Philippi). In this territory most of the inhabitants were pagans—Greeks and Syrians. Philip's long reign was honourably distinguished by just and peaceful rule. While never practising the tyranny of his father, he shared his zeal for building by reconstructing Panias and Bethsaida, to which he gave the names of Cæsarea and Julius, in honour of the Emperor and his daughter.

(ii) *Antipas* (B.C. 4–A.D. 39).—Antipas, Philip's half-brother, received Galilee and Peraea. In character he was a miniature of the old Herod—self-indulgent, ambitious, and crafty. Jesus called him "that fox" (Lk 13<sup>32</sup>). By ingratiating himself with the emperors, and especially with Tiberius, he alienated the Roman officials in his province. Sharing the Herodian fondness for building, he erected a fine new Hellenistically designed capital, and named it Tiberias. Like Philip, he bore the title of tetrarch. Antipas figures in the gospel narrative as the slayer of John the Baptist, who censured him for his unlawful marriage with Herodias (Mt 14<sup>3</sup>; Mk 6<sup>17</sup>; Lk 3<sup>19</sup>). When Pilate remitted Jesus as a prisoner to Antipas for sentence, Antipas merely dismissed Him with mockery and sent Him again to Pilate (Lk 23<sup>7-12</sup>). After being heavily defeated in a war with

the Arabian Aretas, whose daughter he had divorced in order to marry Herodias, Antipas was accused before Caligula by Agrippa, the brother of Herodias, of forming an alliance with the Parthians. As a result, he was banished to Lyons, in Gaul, and his tetrarchy given to Agrippa.

(iii) *Archelaus as Ethmarch* (B.C. 4–A.D. 6).—The hecatomb which Herod had planned did not take place, as Salome and Alexas released the prisoners. The army took the oath of allegiance to Archelaus, who now prepared to set out for Rome to obtain confirmation of Herod's will. He had announced that he intended to reign with a gentleness which would atone for his father's tyranny, but unfortunately, even before his departure for Rome, he had occasion to shed the blood of thousands of his subjects. The people demanded that the counsellors of Herod in the matter of the execution of Mattathias and Judas should be punished. Archelaus tried conciliation, but the fury of the mob increased, so that he was obliged to use military force to disperse them. The first detachment sent against them was put to flight, and not until he had called out all his available troops was order restored. Leaving his brother Philip in charge of the kingdom, he now embarked for Rome. Antipas, his other brother, set out shortly after for the same destination, to press his claims under the previous will in which he had been designated successor to the throne. After hearing both parties Augustus deferred his final decision.

Meanwhile Judæa was again in open rebellion. After Herod's death, Augustus had sent Sabinus as procurator to Palestine pending the settlement of the succession. This Sabinus, by his oppression of the people, and his disregard for their law and customs, provoked a general rising. Jerusalem was crowded, it being the Feast of the Passover, and the people attacked the Romans on all sides. Galled by the stones hurled down upon them

from the roofs of the buildings round the Temple court, the Romans set fire to the cloisters and succeeded in penetrating to the sanctuary. The Temple treasure fell into their hands, and Sabinus helped himself to four hundred talents. He had meanwhile sent to Varus, the governor of Syria, for help, but before assistance could arrive from Antioch, the whole country, provoked by the robbery of the Temple, was again ablaze. Many of the Herodian troops joined the insurgents, and the Roman legion in Jerusalem was besieged in the royal palace. This revolt, however, widespread though it was, had no single leader and no definite object. Judas in Galilee, Simon in Peraea, and Athronges in Judæa proper, each assumed the leadership in his own district, but were almost as hostile, one to the other, as to the Romans. They exerted themselves chiefly in robbery and plunder, thus injuring the Judæans more than the recognized enemy. Varus at length arrived in Galilee with two legions and numerous auxiliaries who had joined him on his march. Sepphoris was burnt, and its inhabitants sold into slavery. Having reduced Galilee, he marched through Samaria, which district, having taken no part in the revolt, was left in peace. On his approach to Jerusalem the besiegers fled without giving battle, and Sabinus and his legion were set free. Two thousand of the rebels were crucified, and many otherwise punished, but upon the masses no vengeance was taken. Varus even allowed a deputation of fifty persons chosen by the people to proceed to Rome in order to urge Augustus to discard the Herodians altogether and to take Judæa under the direct sovereignty of Rome. This step expressed the conviction of the most enlightened among the Jews, who, recognizing Roman supremacy as inevitable, considered that they would have more real freedom, both civil and religious, under the immediate rule of the Emperor than under vassal princes. Having heard all parties, Augustus now gave his decision, and confirmed

the will of his old friend in all important particulars. The outstanding alterations he made were: (1) That Archelaus was not to have the title of king, but that of Ethnarch, with the hope of receiving the royal title on condition of good behaviour; (2) Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos were made "free cities" and placed under the jurisdiction of the Syrian governor; (3) Archelaus had to remit one-quarter of the taxes on Samaria as a reward for their loyalty during the recent rebellion. Of his rule of over nine years we have little detailed knowledge, but he seems to have done his best to follow in his father's footsteps. He set up and deposed high-priests at will, and in cruelty and severity his conduct resembled the late tyrant's. He also took the same pleasure in building as did Herod, particularly in the fertile district of Jericho, as the city of Archelais attests. By the tenth year of his reign his subjects could suffer him no longer and complained to the Emperor. Archelaus was summoned to Rome, deposed by Augustus, and banished to Vienne in Gaul, where he died in exile.

(5) *A Roman Census and Rise of the Zealots*

The first step in reorganizing Judæa as a Roman province was naturally the taking of a census and a complete valuation of the country. But this was abhorrent to the Jews, who began to prepare for resistance. Fortunately, the conciliatory attitude of Joazar, the high-priest, restrained the people, and in A.D. 7 the census was duly completed under Quirinius, governor of Syria. But the revolutionary spirit continued to work like leaven, and from this period dates the rise of the faction to be known later as the Zealots—henceforth the instigators of every revolt against the might of Rome. These "Zealots" were the quintessence of Judaism. They were an offshoot of the Pharisees, whose creed was obedience to the *Law* in all its written and traditional precepts. The Pharisees had no national feeling, and

Syria, Rome, or even the Herodians were all the same to them as secular rulers provided that their law was respected. The Zealots, however, while equally enthusiastic for the law as the guiding principle for Israel, attached as much importance to national independence. The Pharisees hoped for the Messianic kingdom, and were prepared to wait for it; the Zealots likewise hoped for the Messianic kingdom, but were prepared to fight for it. This strong force, composed of both noble and ignoble elements, small perhaps in numbers, but weighty and influential in its appeal to the masses, formed a rallying-point for the discontented of all classes. While respecting the principles of the Zealots (apart from their association with the murderous Sicarii) one cannot but deplore their lack of political foresight. From Judas of Gamala to John of Giscala they steadily contributed to the overthrow of Judæa.

(6) *Judæa under Roman Procurators* (A.D. 6-41):  
*Pontius Pilate—his dismissal by Vitellius, Legate of Syria*

Judæa, along with the whole territory of Archelaus, was now for the first time brought under immediate Roman rule. A governor, styled "Procurator," was appointed, nominally under the imperial legate in Syria, but practically independent.<sup>1</sup>

Of the first four procurators we have little historical evidence, and indeed, apart from Pontius Pilate, little is known of any of them. The Goſpels make us familiar with Pilate, and Josephus and Philo have written at considerable length about him. Whether he is to be taken as typical of the Roman Procurator is hard to say. He seems to have been a conscientious Roman, but rather lacking in the tact required of the governor of a difficult province like Judæa. Failing to profit by a previous collision with the Jews through his bringing into the Holy City standards bearing the Emperor's effigy, he

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1, p. 383.



again attempted a similar outrage upon Jewish susceptibilities. This was the setting-up in the palace of Herod of "votive shields" inscribed with the names of Tiberius and himself. It is true that no "images" were involved in this action, but the shields were taken by the people of Jerusalem as a direct insult. Headed by the surviving sons of Herod, the nobles and the people petitioned the Emperor for the removal of the shields. Tiberius, who had no sympathy with the wanton tyranny of his subordinates, at once ordered Pilate to transfer the offensive shields to Cæsarea. His conduct in the trial of Jesus makes it evident that Pilate was aware of the hostility of the Jews towards him, and was willing to propitiate them even to the extent of delivering up to them "a just man" whom in his own heart he knew to be innocent. He finally compassed his own overthrow by an unjustified attack on the Samaritans. Of all Rome's auxiliary troops, the *Σεβαστηνοί* were considered the most loyal, their loyalty being no doubt stimulated by their traditional hostility to Judæa. In A.D. 35 certain pseudo-prophets having announced that on a fixed day he would unearth the sacred implements which Moses was supposed to have buried in Mount Gerizim, the Samaritans, who had ever opposed the claim of the Jews that Mount Zion was the Holy Mount, assembled in thousands, all at a height of religious enthusiasm. In his short-sightedness or disregard of the religious feelings of the people, Pilate set his troops upon this innocent gathering. Possibly he regarded it as an incipient revolution, but against this must be placed his knowledge of the loyalty of the Samaritans to Rome. On the complaint of the elders, Vitellius, Legate of Syria, sent Pilate to the Emperor to answer for his conduct. Shortly after his dismissal of Pilate, and his appointment of Marcellus as his successor, Vitellius himself came to Jerusalem. His arrival coincided with the Feast of the Passover, but in spite of the great

concourse of Jews in the city, he was welcomed with acclamation. The Syrian Legate shewed his respect for the people in restoring to the high-priest the robe which had been in Roman custody since the deposition of Archelaus, and further gained their goodwill by remitting the tax on market produce. His deposition of Caiaphas was also popular, for though the Roman control of the high-priesthood could not be anything but humiliating in theory, Caiaphas had lost respect through his intimacy with Pilate. In contrast, too, to the late procurator's conduct, Vitellius, when marching against Aretas a year later caused his troops to make a considerable detour in order to avoid carrying his standards through Judæa.

(7) *Troubles under Caligula* (A.D. 37-41)

The short reign of Caligula opened quietly in Judæa. The conciliatory attitude of Vitellius had momentarily allayed hatred towards Rome, and of the administration of Marcellus, the new procurator, nothing is known. But trouble was brewing for the Jews. The first outbreak took place in Alexandria in A.D. 38, the occasion being the refusal of the Jews in that city to render divine honours to the Emperor. Caligula was known to take his self-assumed divinity very seriously, and the Alexandrians seized this opportunity of venting their long-standing hatred upon the Jews, conscious that they might do so with impunity, and even with the royal approval. The Jewish quarter was pillaged, warehouses plundered, men and women abused and murdered. Synagogues were profaned by the setting up of statues of Caligula, and the Jews deprived of the rights of citizenship. These outrages were encouraged by the Roman governor, who refused to forward to the Emperor a petition from the Jews explaining their attitude. An embassy to Caligula, headed by Philo, was treated with contempt, and the condition of the Jews in Alexandria remained unchanged until his death in A.D. 41.

At first the Alexandrian troubles had not affected Judæa itself, but the Mother Country could not long escape. In Jamnia, on the Philistine coast, the heathen population raised an altar to the Emperor, which was destroyed by the Jews of the city. The receipt of this news so enraged Caligula that he ordered a statue of himself to be set up in the Temple at Jerusalem. Knowing that this action would call forth desperate resistance on the part of the Jews, he ordered Petronius, the Legate of Syria, to have half his army ready to enforce his commands. Though this order was revolting to him, Petronius dared not disobey. First he tried to persuade the Jews to submit quietly, but failed. Then, impressed by enormous deputations of Jews, he resolutely sought to delay the setting up of the statue. He accordingly wrote to Caligula appealing for delay on the ground that, as harvest-time was approaching, it would be advisable to secure the crops from the destructive fury of the Jews. This expedient, however, procured only a short respite, as Caligula's reply enjoined all haste in the preparation of the statue. Still Petronius delayed, and finally resolved to write again to remonstrate with the Emperor. Another agent, happily, had addressed himself to Caligula, and with success. Agrippa I., meeting the Emperor in Rome, learned from him what was happening in Palestine. Horrified, he successfully besought Caligula to reverse the hated edict. Petronius was ordered to make no change in the Temple at Jerusalem ; but at the same time instructions were given that any one who wished might build a temple or an altar to the Emperor outside Jerusalem. Fortunately, none took advantage of this permission. The letter of Petronius arrived in Rome after Caligula had already granted Agrippa's request. Infuriated that an officer should dare to advise him, Caligula ordered him to take his own life. This command, however, was considerably delayed in transit, and Petronius received the news of

the murder of Caligula nearly a month before that of his death sentence. Claudius was now raised to the throne by the aid of the armies, and Agrippa, having had some part in securing the succession for him, received as a reward Judæa and Samaria in addition to Galilee and Peraea, which he had held under Caligula. The kingdom of Herod the Great was once again united under the rule of his grandson.

(8) *Agrippa I.* (A.D. 41-44)

Agrippa I. was the son of Aristobulus, who along with his brother Alexander had been put to death by Herod I. in B.C. 7. He had been sent to Rome when scarcely six years old, to be educated, and not until he was nearly forty years of age did he again set foot in Palestine. His youth and early manhood were spent at the imperial court, where his extravagance led him into debt. On the death of the Emperor's son, Drusus, who had befriended him, he lost favour at court. Bankrupt, he had to flee from his creditors, and made his way to Palestine. In despair, he was contemplating suicide, but his wife, Cypros, persuaded Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee, to help him. Antipas, besides being Agrippa's uncle, was also his brother-in-law, having married Herodias, Agrippa's sister. He gave his distressed relative the superintendentship of markets in Tiberias, but a quarrel between the two caused Agrippa to throw up this post and try his fortune with Flaccus, governor of Syria. Detected in accepting bribes from the people of Damascus, and thus losing the favour of Flaccus, he again found himself destitute. He succeeded in raising a loan in Ptolemais sufficient to carry him to Alexandria, where, on the credit of his wife, he obtained still more and, sending his family back to Palestine, made his way to Italy. He succeeded in regaining the favour of Tiberius, who gave him the care of his grandson, but more important for his future prospects was the intimacy he

established with Caius Caligula. Falling deeper and deeper into debt, however, he could see no escape from his embarrassments except through the death of Tiberius. He imprudently spoke of his hopes in the presence of one who, being afterwards accused by Agrippa of theft, communicated his remarks to the old Emperor. Agrippa was thrown into prison, and was not released until Caligula succeeded Tiberius in A.D. 37.

His assiduous cultivation of the friendship of Caligula now began to bear fruit. The new Emperor immediately gave him the tetrarchy of Philip (which, since the latter's death in A.D. 34, had been incorporated with Syria), to which he added that of Lysanias, and conferred on him the title of king. Until Caligula's death most of his time was spent in Rome. Late in the year 38 he made his first appearance in his new kingdom, and in the following year caused the downfall of Antipas. His short reign of three years was a happy one for the Jews, especially for the Pharisees. He was scrupulous in observing their laws and ceremonies, and guarded the sanctity of the synagogues even outside his own territory, his influence being sufficient to secure the punishment of desecrators of the synagogue in Dora, a Phœnician city. He lived continuously in Jerusalem, and took part in the Temple services. He further gained favour with the Pharisees by persecuting the Christians. James suffered martyrdom under him, and only a miracle saved Peter from the same fate. His strengthening of the fortifications of Jerusalem was doubtless meant to increase his popularity with the nationalist party, but Agrippa, so well acquainted with the might of Rome, can scarcely have contemplated revolt. In any case, the works were stopped by an injunction of the Emperor. Another scheme of his was nipped in the bud by Roman interference when, at his invitation, five vassal-kings assembled at Tiberias. The Syrian governor ordered them home before any conference could take place, but

we can see that it was in Agrippa's mind to establish himself at the head of a confederacy of allied kingdoms. Though zealous in conforming to Pharisaism in the Holy Land, he shed his Jewish piety as soon as he went abroad. In cities like Berytus and Cæsarea he built theatres and amphitheatres, and held games and gladiatorial combats. If he deliberately avoided placing his image on coins minted in Jerusalem, it appears on those struck in other cities. His submission to Pharisaic law was purely a matter of policy. As Henry of Navarre in later days considered Paris "well worth a Mass," so Agrippa considered peace and security in Judæa cheaply bought by an outward conformity to Jewish law. The circumstances of his death are well known, though our two narratives of the event vary in detail. In the Acts of the Apostles it is related that at Cæsarea, after making a speech to the ambassadors of Tyre and Sidon, which the people hailed with these words, "It is the voice of a god, and not of a man," he was stricken by the angel of the Lord because "he gave not God the glory." Josephus makes his appearance at certain games in Cæsarea the occasion of his death, and the brilliance of his robe the cause of the people hailing him as a god. Immediately thereafter he saw an owl sitting on a rope, which evil omen he took as a warning of approaching death. He was seized with violent internal pains, and died five days after. Though Claudius was willing to allow his only son, Agrippa II.,<sup>1</sup> to succeed him, he was persuaded by his advisers to take the whole kingdom under direct Roman rule as in the government of Judæa and Samaria from A.D. 6-41.

(9) *The Roman Procurators* (A.D. 44-66)

After the three years' reign of Agrippa, during which the Jewish national kingdom had seemed to be once more restored, the rule of the Roman procurators was

<sup>1</sup> See Note 2, p. 385.

all the harder to tolerate. From the death of Agrippa, the student of history can watch, step by step, the unfolding of the tragedy which reached its climax in the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, in the same manner as the spectators at the presentation of a Greek tragedy could see the inevitable doom in which the leading characters were involved, though those concerned were blind to their fate. The conduct of the Jews themselves, and of the Roman procurators, made the tragic climax unavoidable. But the zealots, to whom foreign rule was intolerable, and the Sicarii, a fanatical offshoot of the zealots, contributed quite as much to the fall of the Holy City. With the reinstatement of the procuratorial system in Judæa, Rome appears to have abandoned that respect for the peculiar idiosyncrasies and customs of the people which had marked the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. Under these emperors the petty tyrannies of the local governors and their wanton insults to the people were checked from above, and ignominious removal from office, as in the case of Pilate, was always a possible punishment for such misconduct. Nero, however, cared not how the people of the provinces fared, provided that order was maintained and that the revenues were forthcoming.

Fadus, the first procurator appointed by Claudius, appears to have been a just and upright man, and, apart from his attempt to control the robes of the high-priest, made no encroachments on the privileges of the Jews. Even in the matter of the robes, he allowed a deputation to proceed to Rome, and this embassy, through the mediation of the younger Agrippa, was successful in maintaining the right of the high-priest to keep the robes in his own custody. The appearance of Theudas later in the rule of Fadus, and the large following which he attracted, was an ebullition of the Messianic hopes which at this time were stirring the nation. Whether or not he was actually contemplating an armed

revolt against Rome, he had no opportunity of shewing, though it is probable that he was, as his followers were mostly Zealots. Fadus, at any rate, was taking no risks, and fell upon the gathering with his troops, completely dispersing them and beheading Theudas himself.

Tiberius Alexander succeeded Fadus. Though of Jewish descent (he was a nephew of Philo of Alexandria), he had renounced Judaism and entered the service of Rome. Apart from his stringent measures in maintaining order, which included the crucifying of the two sons of Judas the Gaulonite, he may be classed with Fadus as infinitely better than the procurators who followed. As an apostate Jew, however, he could not be popular, and his true feelings may be deduced from the fact that he took an active part on the side of Rome in the great war against Jerusalem twenty years later.

With the next procurator, Ventidius Cumanus (A.D. 48-52), commenced a series of outbreaks culminating in the open war which broke out in A.D. 66. The first of these cannot be said to be the fault of Cumanus. It was caused by the act of a private soldier, one of a party sent to maintain order in Jerusalem at the Passover. In the Court of the Temple he rudely insulted the Jewish religion. Had the Jews been in a less excitable state, they would have seen that the act of a private soldier was no real indication of Roman policy, but, blinded with fury and hatred, the mob, led by the Zealots, again rose in riot. Cumanus, unable to appease the rioters by peaceable means, ordered out his troops, and although according to Josephus they used measures little more severe than would the present-day police in dispersing a seditious crowd, yet thousands perished in the crush occasioned by their flight.

Two further collisions with the people marked the rule of Cumanus. A Roman official was robbed on the road near Jerusalem. Cumanus ordered that the neighbouring villages should be pillaged, and the elders held



accountable for the crime. A Roman soldier having found a copy of the Pentateuch, tore it up with curses. Such profanity again roused the people, but on this occasion they used the method which had proved so efficacious with Petronius, and besieged the procurator with deputations, until he had the offender beheaded. The final clash, which led to the dismissal of Cumanus, originated with the murder in the territory of Samaria of certain Galileans journeying to Jerusalem to the Feast. Applications for redress had no result, Cumanus, it is supposed, having been bribed by the Samaritans. The traditional enmity of the Jews to the Samaritans inspired them to take revenge, and the Zealots, as enemies both of Rome and Samaria, were naturally foremost in this movement. A Jewish force made an inroad into Samaria, and slew many in the border towns and villages. This, of course, was more than Cumanus could tolerate, and marching from Cæsarea with his troops, he fell upon the Jews and utterly routed them. Both parties then sent deputations to Quadratus, governor of Syria, who, after full inquiry, referred the matter to Rome. Jews and Samaritans alike suffered; for though Quadratus held the Samaritans to be the instigators of the trouble, he caused the ringleaders of the Jews to be crucified. The Samaritans who went to Rome were condemned to death by Claudius as false witnesses, and Cumanus was banished. The younger Agrippa, who, like his father, had considerable influence at Rome, was instrumental in obtaining this decision in favour of the Jews. But there was another factor. A certain Felix, a freedman of Claudius, and brother of Pallas who was a favourite with the Emperor, had accompanied Cumanus to Palestine. What his office exactly was is uncertain, but it was believed in the country that he was the real representative of Rome. He had probably been sent with Cumanus as one who would make authentic reports to Rome regarding the conduct of that governor. In

the affairs of Judæa proper he had taken no prominent part, preferring to associate with the Samaritans. But, just as Cumanus had been bribed by the Samaritans, so Felix had accepted bribes from the Jews, and even Quadratus had not dared to accuse the brother of the all-powerful Pallas. The Jews, therefore, won their cause at Rome, but at what a cost ! Felix was appointed to succeed Cumanus, and his comparatively long rule was to goad Judæa into that final revolt which was her ruin.

From A.D. 52-60 Felix governed Judæa. Of one who had been so long in the country, who had championed their cause at Rome, and who had married a Jewish princess (Drusilla, daughter of Agrippa I.), much was expected by the Sanhedrin. The brother of Pallas thought that he had little to fear from the imperial court at Rome, and indeed even after the accession of Nero in A.D. 54 his misgovernment continued long unchecked. He accepted bribes from all and sundry, and the scales of justice ever tipped in favour of him who had the heaviest purse. The discontented so augmented the ranks of the Zealots that Felix had to take active measures against them. He seized Eleasar, one of their leaders, and sent him to Rome with many of his followers, and crucified innumerable "robbers."

About this time we note the rise of the "Sicarii," a more dangerous scourge to the country than the robbers. Their method of attack upon Rome and her Jewish supporters was that of assassination. But they so contrived to stab their enemies in the midst of crowds that, by pretending indignation at the deed, they usually escaped detection. The high-priest Jonathan, who had used his influence to have Felix appointed governor, was one of the first to fall by these means, though it is said that Felix himself instigated this crime, being wearied with Jonathan's irksome admonitions. Knowing that Felix would not punish them, the Sicarii killed many more of the moderate party, and became a terror through-

out the land. While the Sicarii may be termed "political fanatics," there arose at the same time many "religious fanatics," professing, like Theudas, to be able to perform miracles. One, an Egyptian Jew, promised that, like Joshua at Jericho, he would cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall. A great multitude gathered on the Mount of Olives, but Felix fell upon them as Judas had done upon Theudas. The fugitives who escaped the slaughter now joined with the Sicarii and the robbers, as having one common purpose—the expulsion of the Romans.

While things were thus going from bad to worse all over the country, a series of riots arose in Cæsarea which led to the recall of Felix. As had so often happened in the coast towns of Palestine, disputes occurred between the Jews and the pagans over civil precedence. Hot words resulted in violent clashes between the rivals, and when the Jews gained the advantage, Felix, exasperated, set his troops on them and allowed some of the richest houses to be plundered.<sup>1</sup> Hearing of these disturbances, Nero recalled Felix in A.D. 60, sending to replace him Porcius Festus, and afterwards gave his decision against the Jews, Cæsarea being declared a Hellenic city.

During the short rule of Festus (A.D. 60–62) he was utterly unable to undo the evil caused by Felix. The anarchy created by the Sicarii remained as great as ever. He had trouble too with multitudes led by a new magician or prophet, and had to proceed with rigour against him. Festus died in office, however, without being able to reduce to order the chaotic conditions which prevailed.

He was succeeded by Albinus (A.D. 62–64). The rule of the second last procurator was merely an exaggeration of that of Felix. He accepted bribes from the high-priest's party and from the Sicarii, and allowed them to do as they pleased. Jerusalem was a prey to anarchy, and the Sicarii became bolder and stronger as they were

<sup>1</sup> Of Felix, Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 9, says: "per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem jus regium servilli ingenio exercuit."

able to make away with their enemies with impunity. On the receipt of the news of his recall, Albinus caused the worst criminals in the prisons to be executed, and set all the other prisoners at liberty for considerable ransoms, thus getting as much money as possible from his period of office.

Gessius Florus (A.D. 64-66), the last procurator, obtained his appointment in much the same way as Felix had, namely, by favouritism. His wife was very friendly with the Empress Poppæa. As he was the last, so he was the worst. His taking of bribes was quite open; he even shared their booty with the robbers. His plundering of the Temple treasury to the extent of seventeen talents was the last straw. Seething with indignation, the people demanded an appeal to Cæsar. A sarcastic jest against the procurator, in the shape of beggar's bags "to help the poor and unfortunate Florus," so enraged him that he marched on Jerusalem, plundered part of the city, and crucified many of the inhabitants. The supplications of Agrippa's sister, Berenice, and of the chief men of the city, induced him to agree to proceed no further provided the people, as a token of submissiveness, would go out to greet the Roman troops arriving from Cæsarea. The priests persuaded the citizens to do this, lest their refusal should lead to the destruction of the Temple. The procession accordingly set out, but the Romans treated their greeting with contempt, whereupon the hotheaded Zealots cried out upon Florus as a traitor. This was the signal for the commencement of a slaughter which continued even to the streets of Jerusalem. The Romans, however, failed to obtain possession of the Temple Mount, and Florus was compelled to withdraw, leaving one cohort in the castle of Antonia. Agrippa II. now arrived in Jerusalem and endeavoured to persuade the people to give up all idea of a war against Rome. The Sanhedrin and most of the citizens were prepared to submit in all things save in rendering

obedience to Florus, but as this was an essential condition Agrippa withdrew, having accomplished nothing.

(10) *The Jewish War with Rome* (A.D. 66-73)

The revolt was now openly against Rome, not against Florus only, and this was signalized by the discontinuance of the daily sacrifice for the Emperor. The peace party, still in hopes of making terms with Rome, applied for aid from Agrippa, who sent 3000 troops. These succeeded in taking and holding for a short time the upper city, but were eventually compelled to retire to the palace of Herod. The victorious party burned the palaces of Ananias, Agrippa, and Berenice, and also the public archives. They then attacked the castle of Antonia, which they took, and slaughtered the garrison. The palace of Herod was next assaulted, and though offering a stronger resistance, eventually capitulated. The troops of Agrippa were allowed to retire from Jerusalem, but the Romans were cut down after disarming themselves. Ananias, the high-priest, who had been in hiding, was captured and put to death.

Divisions now arose in the ranks of the victors. The success of the attacks upon the castle of Antonia and the palace of Herod had been largely due to the leadership of Manakem, son of Judas the Gaulonite, and his followers, the most fanatical of the Zealots, proclaimed him King, considering that he was the Messiah for whom they had waited. Eleasar, however, the leader of the more moderate section of the Zealots, could not brook the idea of kingship, and contrived to have him captured, tortured, and slain. For the moment, therefore, the extremists were held in check, and the moderate party set about reorganizing the State. Meanwhile Judæa, and indeed the whole of Palestine, was in a state of anarchy. In the absence of any real controlling power Jew massacred Gentile, and Gentile Jew, according as each predominated in cities of mixed populations. Such

disorders could no longer be tolerated by Cestius Gallus, governor of Syria, who now advanced from Antioch with Roman regulars, reinforced by many auxiliaries. Not without suffering losses, he finally took possession of Bezetha, the northern suburb of Jerusalem. But his attack on the Temple Mount failed, and he then withdrew. His retreat, however, was not to be carried out unharassed. At Beth-horon, in a narrow ravine, he was ambushed by the Jews, and extricated his forces only at the cost of nearly 6000 slain and the total loss of his baggage train.

This defeat of the governor of Syria himself brought all parties together in Judæa. Even those previously most prominent in the peace party lent their aid to the prosecution of the rebellion. The Sanhedrin was the supreme power in the State, although the military commanders were elected by the assembly of the people. The votes of the citizens went in favour of men who had been prominent in the moderate party. Even Eleasar, who had been foremost in driving the Romans out of the city, was not elected to any post, though he had great influence with the people. Josephus, the historian, was elected to the military command in Galilee. With little or no help from Jerusalem he put in a state of fortification the various strongholds of the country, and endeavoured to raise an army on the Roman model. The Galileans, however, had their factions as well as Jerusalem, and the leader of the extremists was one John of Giscala, later to be one of the main figures in the siege of Jerusalem. Josephus and John were at daggers-drawn, and would gladly have got rid of each other. Attempts at assassination having failed, John sent to Jerusalem and secured orders for the recall of Josephus. The latter, however, was able to temporize until he himself had sent a deputation to Jerusalem and obtained confirmation of his authority. John was forced to take refuge in his native Giscala.

The defeat of Cestius Gallus made Nero realize that the Judæan revolt was not to be taken lightly, and he therefore appointed Vespasian, the best of his generals, to command the Roman forces against the Jews. Vespasian assembled his army at Antioch, and sent his son Titus to Alexandria to bring reinforcements. The campaign opened with the occupation of Sepphoris by 6000 Romans without opposition. Soon after this Titus arrived, and Vespasian had at his disposal some 60,000 men. The army which Josephus had been at such pains to organize would not face the Romans in the open, and the war became a process of attack and defence of the principal strongholds. The fortress of Jotapata, whose defence was conducted by Josephus himself, held out heroically for forty-seven days. It was carried by assault early one morning, and 40,000 of its defenders slain. Josephus surrendered, and probably saved his life by prophesying to Vespasian that he would soon ascend the imperial throne. The remaining fortresses of Galilee fell one after the other. John of Giscala escaped from his native town the night before it opened its gates to Titus, and made his way to Jerusalem.

Galilee had not fallen without a struggle, and had occupied Vespasian throughout the whole of the campaigning season of A.D. 67. The Roman troops went into winter quarters, but were occupied in isolating Jerusalem. By June A.D. 68 the capital was the only centre of resistance in Palestine, and all was ready for the commencement of the siege. On 9th June Nero committed suicide, and Vespasian suspended hostilities to await events. Every modern writer on the political struggles in the Holy City during the years 67-69 has commented on the obvious parallel between Jerusalem at this time and Paris in 1789-93. The reverses sustained in Galilee were attributed by the Zealots to the inefficiency and lukewarmness of the moderates, and the arrival in Jerusalem of John of Giscala, burning with hatred

towards Josephus, a moderate, was the signal for the outbreak of hostilities between the two parties. Though the Zealots were in the minority, they gained over to their side the hotblooded and youthful element in the city. They incited the mob to denounce three of the Herodian family who stood by the national cause, and had them thrown into prison, where they were murdered. The head of the moderate party was Ananus, a *persona grata* with the people. When the Zealots proposed some revolutionary schemes touching the high-priesthood, Ananus succeeded in stirring up the populace against them, and the Zealots were compelled to retreat to the inner temple, where they were besieged, though not assaulted—respect for the sacred edifice holding back their opponents.

Now was the time for one side or the other to call in outside forces to its aid, and John of Giscala hit upon the idea of soliciting the help of the Idumæans. They readily acquiesced, and, 20,000 strong, presented themselves before the gates of Jerusalem. Then began a reign of terror such as has not been seen till 1793. All the leaders of the moderates were hunted down and slain, the Zealots hounding on their Idumæan allies to atrocity after atrocity. At length the Idumæans withdrew, satiated with murder and plunder; but they left the Zealots supreme in the city, with John of Giscala in control.

At this time in Judæa, outside Jerusalem, arose the commanding personality of Simon ben-Giora. Of a warlike and indomitable spirit comparable to John of Giscala, he harried and plundered Southern Palestine, and had made such a name for himself that in the spring of A.D. 69 the inhabitants of Jerusalem, wearied of the tyrannical rule of John, called him in to their aid. His entry into the city brought no relief to the wretched people, as John was almost impregvably perched on the Temple Mount, and all Simon's efforts to dislodge him failed.



In succession to Nero, Galba was elevated to the imperial dignity, but before Vespasian's son Titus could arrive in Rome to convey his congratulations to the new Emperor, news of Galba's assassination was received. Otho and Vitellius were now (A.D. 69) contending for the throne, and the victory of the latter, after Vespasian had acknowledged Otho, had the effect of encouraging the armies of the East to take their own part in emperor-making. They proclaimed their own general Emperor. Assured of the support of Egypt and Syria, Vespasian set out for Rome to consolidate his position, and left Titus to prosecute the Jewish War. In April of A.D. 70 Titus arrived before the walls of Jerusalem with one legion more at his command than his father had ; yet the internal dissensions in the city had not ceased. A third party had now arisen, consisting of the priestly Zealots under Eleasar, who held the inner Temple, to the exclusion of John of Giscala, who was constantly attacked by Simon. This triangular civil warfare continued even until Titus appeared at the gates, and greatly impaired the city's powers of resistance, much of the grain stored with a view to sustaining a siege being destroyed by one or other of these factions. However, with the forces of Titus in sight, John stormed the inner Temple and reduced Eleasar's party to submission. John and Simon now combined for the defence of the city.

(II) *Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and end of the Jewish State*

The situation of Jerusalem was such that it could only be attacked from the north with any hope of success, and it was accordingly against the most northerly wall, that built by Agrippa, that Titus commenced siege operations. In spite of desperate sallies by the defenders, this wall was breached by the battering-rams of the besiegers on 7th May, fifteen days after the beginning of siege operations. This gave the Romans possession of the

whole of the New City, but still left them the harder task of storming the lower city, the Temple Mount, and the upper city. The second wall protecting the lower city was breached five days later, but the Jews drove back their assailants with heavy loss. Four days were required by the Romans to regain their lost position, and the defenders now retired to the third wall guarding the upper city on the west and the Temple Mount on the east. The strong point guarding the Temple was the castle of Antonia, which John defended, while Simon held the upper city. With immense labour four ramparts were raised against this wall, but the Jewish defenders only waited for their completion to destroy them by setting fire to the wooden supports of the galleries which they had dug underneath them.

The Romans were now exasperated by the stubborn resistance of the Jews. Though repeatedly summoned to surrender on terms, no attention was paid, probably the more so as it was the deserter Josephus who carried the summons. But many of the citizens, driven to seek for sustenance outside the walls, were captured and crucified. At this stage Titus, determined to cut off all means of ingress or egress, surrounded the city with a stone wall strongly guarded. The famine had reached such a height that more died daily from starvation than from the assaults of the enemy. Three weeks were needed to rebuild the ramparts, and this time the Jewish attempts to destroy them failed. Battering rams were brought to bear, and part of the wall crumbled, but, pressing into the breach, the Romans were astonished and chagrined to discover that the Jews had raised a new wall behind it. A few days later, however, this wall was scaled under cover of darkness, and the Jews driven back to the Temple. Though eventually forced to give ground, the Romans retained possession of the castle of Antonia, which Titus caused to be demolished.

Operations were now directed against the Temple,

and by 8th August the battering-rams were thundering against the immense walls, but in vain. Scaling ladders were next employed, but every Roman who attempted to ascend was hurled to his death. At length the northern gate was burnt down, giving the Romans access to the outer court. Titus gave strict orders that the Temple was to be spared, but in repulsing one of the fierce sorties of the Jews from the inner court one of the soldiers threw a blazing brand into an annexe of the sanctuary. Thus started a conflagration which neither the Jews nor Titus himself could quench. The immense treasures of the Temple were carried off by the conquerors. All the occupants of the mount, armed or unarmed, were ruthlessly slain, except a band under John and Simon, who succeeded in cutting their way to the upper city.

Though with the ruin of the Temple the cause for which Judæa had fought was definitely overthrown, Titus had still to take the upper city where the two foremost leaders of the Jews stubbornly held out. When summoned to surrender, they demanded liberty for themselves, their wives, and children to retire unharmed, but this Titus refused. Siege works were again raised by the Romans, but so desperate was the resistance that not until 8th September was a breach in the walls effected. Further resistance on the part of the weakened defenders was hopeless, and John and Simon, with many others, were soon captives of Titus. Jerusalem was now razed to the ground. Of the countless prisoners taken, some seven hundred of the tallest and noblest were saved to grace the somewhat premature triumphal procession of Titus. For the same purpose the sacred vessels of the Temple, with a copy of the Torah or Jewish Law, were also carried to Rome. With the exception referred to, all who had been in arms were slain; those under seventeen were sold as slaves, and the remainder kept for gladiatorial shows or forced labour in Egypt. Simon was put to death after the triumph, but John, having

begged for mercy, was spared, only to suffer lifelong imprisonment.

Three fortresses in the south-west of Judæa still held out. Herodium soon surrendered, and Machærus also capitulated, the garrison being granted an honourable retreat after a more protracted defence. Masâda, garrisoned by Sicarii, and situated upon an almost impregnable rock, made a desperate resistance. Not until April A.D. 73 did the Romans succeed in reducing it, and on entering the fortress they found only dead bodies, the garrison having slaughtered their own families, and then one another, on perceiving that further resistance was hopeless. With the fall of Masâda the last vestige of Jewish independence vanished, and from this time onwards the Jews were a nation without a country.

## CHAPTER II

### THE JEWISH WORLD

#### A. IN PALESTINE

##### I. JEWISH CIVIL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL LIFE AT THE ADVENT OF CHRIST

###### (I) *The Land of Palestine*

IN Biblical usage the name Palestine (Heb. *Pēlesheth*, Gk. *Philistia*) is the designation of the coastal territory occupied by the Philistines, but by Greek and Roman writers it was applied to the entire region set apart in the OT as the inheritance of the Israelitish race. In the proverbial phrase this extended "from Dan to Beersheba," that is, from Mount Hermon to the *Negeb*, or border of the south Arabian desert. It measured about 160 miles in length, with an average breadth of about 40 miles, exclusive of Peraea. It was a country about the size of Wales, characterized then, as now, by contrasts of sandy desert, rocky hills, and rich vegetation. The hill country is mostly fit only for pastoral use, but toward the coast and in the trans-Jordanic valleys there is excellent grazing ground for cattle. Though scarcely ranking as a well-wooded country, Palestine is the home of the olive, the cedar, and the sycamore, and yields large quantities of dates and oranges. A bright and sunny land, it suffers somewhat from drought, particularly in the south. Its water supply is derived mainly from the Jordan and inland reservoirs fed from that river. In Scripture it is poetically referred to as "a land flowing with milk and honey," and in the ideal future

portrayed by the prophets its " mountains drip with new wine, and all the hills are aflow with milk " (Am 9<sup>13</sup>), and " all the brooks of Judah run with water " (Joel 3<sup>18</sup>)—poetic generalizations these, eloquent of the fertility and charm of the country, and broad-based upon a galaxy of beauty-spots up and down the land.

No exact estimate can be made of the population of Palestine in pre-Christian times, but in its palmiest days it probably never exceeded three millions.<sup>1</sup> Yet the moral and spiritual influence exercised by the people of this tiny country has been immeasurably great. Its geographical situation rendered it peculiarly suitable for the working out of the Divine purpose of isolating a people from the pagan world, in order through their history to make known to them Jahweh's character and will with a view to their becoming the medium of His revelation to all mankind. " Within its small area it included every variety of scenery and climate, from the eternal snows of Hermon to the steaming tropical valley of Jericho, so that the language and imagery of the Bible have points of contact with and are easily understood by all the races of the world." <sup>2</sup> While shut off from the neighbouring peoples by arid deserts, it was located in the very centre of ancient civilization. Its soil was traversed by the great caravan route from the Nile to the Euphrates, and it was the usual fighting-ground between Assyria and Egypt ; but the Jews, hemmed in by their rugged hills, were safeguarded alike from armed hosts marching to war and from the temptation to join in the race for earthly glory through militarism, trade, and material wealth. They were thus providentially placed in a position at once of sheltered detachment and

<sup>1</sup> The statements of 2 Chron 14<sup>8</sup> that King Asa had an army of 580,000 men, and of Josephus (*BJ* iii. 3, 2) that the smallest township in Galilee had 15,000 inhabitants, must be regarded as examples of picturesque Oriental exaggeration.

<sup>2</sup> J. D. Rose, *The Life of Christ and Christian Ethics*, p. 1.

of world-commanding influence. Only after the denationalization of Israelitish religion by the teaching of Jesus did it spread quickly across the plains to the shores of the Mediterranean. It is significant that in the narrative of the Acts so much prominence is given to Lydda, Gaza, Joppa, and Cæsarea.

In point of physical geography the land comprises four longitudinal sections—the Maritime Plain, the Western (or Central) mountain range, the Jordan Valley, and the trans-Jordanic region.

As already mentioned, the name Palestine is strictly the designation of the Maritime Plain inhabited by the Philistines. This consists of a stretch of country covering the 32 miles from Ekron to Gaza, with an average breadth of about 12 miles. It forms an undulating plain to the east of which lies the Shephelah (=“ foot-hills ” or “ lowlands ”), composed of horizontal strata of limestone cut across by numerous little valleys. After a sharp descent of some 500 feet these lead up to the hill country of the high central range, the section of the coast plain to the north of Joppa being known as the Plain of Sharon, a pastoral and flowery space extending from the latitude of Gaza to that of Joppa. With no natural harbour except the Bay of Acre, where the modern seaport of Haifa was opened in 1933, the inhabitants of Palestine, unlike the Phœnicians, were little in contact with the sea. The writer of the Epistle of James seems, however, to have been familiar with the roaring of the waves (3<sup>4</sup>), possibly through acquaintance with the tumultuous roadstead of Joppa, the one harbour in Jewish possession (1 Macc 14<sup>5</sup>) until Herod constructed the magnificent artificial haven of Cæsarea, completed in B.C. 10. Be this as it may, Joppa is expressly associated with the vision of Peter as recorded in Acts 10.

The Central Range, an offshoot from the lower slopes of the Lebanon, is intercepted by the great Plain of Esdraelon lying between the Galilean and Samaritan

hills. Triangular in form, it stretches from the Bay of Acre to the valley of the Jordan. Like the modern Flanders, it was for centuries the battlefield of nations. Rising rapidly from the plain, the tableland runs northwards for 70 miles, with diminishing height. Toward the south it again assumes mountainous dimensions, and in the vicinity of Hebron reaches a height of about 3500 feet. From the edge of the Central Range rises the hill country of Judæa, furrowed with crooked and precipitous defiles, whose streams, mostly winter-torrents, empty themselves either into the Jordan or into the sea.

By reason of its extraordinary depression the Jordan Valley (the *Ghor*) ranks as a unique physical phenomenon. The chief source of the river is at Pnias (Cæsarea Philippi), where it suddenly emerges from under a heap of stones as a considerable stream. Joined by two other streams (the Hasbâny and the Leddan), and winding swiftly through a rich and well-wooded district, it descends about 1100 feet to Lake Huleh (Merom), where it is practically at sea-level. After a further course of 11 miles it falls at the Sea of Galilee to 682 feet below the level of the sea. The southern section of the Jordan valley is of varying width, and extends from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, a distance of only 65 miles in a straight line, but the actual course of the winding river, which "wiggles like a corkscrew," is three times as great. In its flow between the two "seas" it again falls about 600 feet, being thus nearly 1300 feet below sea-level at its entrance into the Salt Sea. When swollen by winter-torrents it overflows its banks and is impassable, and even at ordinary times it fords are perilous. While as a whole the ancient Jordan valley was extremely fertile, in parts its dense brushwood afforded a convenient lair for wild beasts. The temperature at Jericho is tropical, yet at Jerusalem, only 16 miles distant, it is not unusual for snow to fall in winter to a depth of a foot or



more. So remarkable are the vivid contrasts which Palestine presents.

Account has still to be taken of Transjordan or Eastern Palestine.<sup>1</sup> Ituræa,<sup>2</sup> the most northerly part of the "Damascus" country lay on the lower spurs of Mount Hermon. It formed part of the OT Bashan, as did likewise Auranitis (Hauran) and Batanaea (the Greek form of Bashan) on the south. Hauran proper, a great treeless plain<sup>3</sup> about 50 miles long by 20 broad, was on the east of Gaulonitis (Jaulan), but the name included also the lands stretching southwards to the Yarmuk and eastwards to the desert. The Hauran country, "the granary of Syria," was famed for its rich pastures and giant oaks. It seems to have been a nest of robbers who preyed upon their neighbours in the valleys.

To the south-east of Ituræa was the rugged Trachonitis,<sup>4</sup> with its forest-clad ridges of limestone rising to a height of 2000 feet between the Jordan and the desert. Bisected by the Jabbok, which flows through the mountains from the east, it extended from the Yarmuk to a

<sup>1</sup> Owing to the shifting nomenclature of the main divisions of Eastern Palestine and the lack of an exact definition of their limits, some confusion attaches to the geographical outlay of the country. A useful comparative table is given by Sir G. A. Smith (*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*<sup>3</sup>, p. 553), with the names of the leading divisions respectively at the present day, at the Crusades, in NT times, and in OT times. Here we adopt mainly the names current in NT times, when, as previously under the Greek dominion, the whole territory was known as Cœle-Syria. Its principal subdivisions were (a) the region of Damascus; (b) that north of the Yarmuk (Tetrarchy of Philip plus part of Decapolis, Gaulonitis, Auranitis, Trachonitis, and possibly Batanaea); (c) that between Yarmuk and Jabbok (Decapolis, with part of Peraea); (d) that between Jabbok and Arnon (Peraea); (e) south of Arnon (Nabataean territory).

<sup>2</sup> Referred to in Lk 3<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Hauran means "hollow." It is mentioned in Ezek 47<sup>16, 18</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> So called because containing the Trachon (Τραχών="a rugged stony tract"). Strabo speaks of "the two so-called Trachones behind Damascus." The Trachon, however, was the Lejá, and Trachonitis clearly meant that and the surrounding district.

line parallel with the north end of the Dead Sea and forming the border of the bare plateau of Moab, which is split by the deep gorge of the Arnon.<sup>1</sup> Although peopled largely by rude cave-dwellers, Trachonitis contained several cities belonging to the confederacy of the Decapolis. Kanatha, its capital, Hippos, Gadara, and Pella were all among its "ten cities." It spread itself over a wide range from Damascus to Gerasa, and had also as one of its constituent members the strong fortress of Scythopolis on the west of the Jordan. The other original members of the League were Dion, Raphana, and Philadelphia. Later on Abila, Edrei, Bosra, and other towns helped to form a greater Decapolis. The population of these towns being Greek, they naturally provided themselves with theatres, amphitheatres, and all the usual institutions of Hellenic civilization.

Still farther to the south, and stretching from the Jabbok to the Dead Sea, was the prosperous region of Peraea,<sup>2</sup> to which belonged such well-known cities as Pella and Gerasa, equipped with fine buildings, aqueducts, colonnades, and bridges. The famous fortress of Machærus, where John the Baptist was imprisoned and beheaded, dominated its southern border and safeguarded it from the Arabians on the east and on the south. While an exceptionally healthy and well-watered region, Eastern Palestine, until held by the iron hand of Rome, was never secure against invasion by the nomads of the desert. The boundary line between it and Arabia was not strictly drawn, and its people were driven to fortify themselves against violent assault by means of subterranean strongholds and cave dwellings. In Edrei we have a notable instance of a whole city existing practically underground.

<sup>1</sup> Ammon occupied the territory to the north-east of Moab on the upper reaches of the Jabbok ; it was the southern part of Gilead.

<sup>2</sup> It was usual to divide the Jewish territory into Judæa, Galilee, and Peraea.

Under Roman rule Western Palestine was partitioned into three sections—Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa.

Galilee embraced all Northern Palestine on this side the Jordan. It measured about 50 miles in length and 30 in breadth, and stretched from the district of Tyre on the north to Samaria on the south, and from Ptolemais on the west to Gaulonitis on the east. Upper Galilee, extending from the river Leontes to a line drawn from Acre to the northern end of the Lake of Tiberias, was a mountainous offshoot from the Lebanon range, with a mixed population mostly composed of Phœnicians and Syrians, but including also Arabians and Greeks (Mt 4<sup>15</sup>). In Lower Galilee the hills are on a smaller scale, and the country more suited for agriculture. Its capital was Sepphoris, situated on the *Via maris*, the much-frequented trade route from the coast to Damascus. After its destruction by Varus it was rebuilt in Greek style by Herod Antipas, who made it the capital, "the defence or ornament (*πρόσχημα*) of all Galilee."<sup>1</sup> The village of Nazareth lay midway between the Mediterranean and the Lake of Gennesaret, on the slope of a hill in the heart of an extremely fertile district. Also remarkable for beauty and luxuriant vegetation was the valley between Panias and Scythopolis. Like Nazareth, where He was brought up, the Sea of Galilee is closely associated with the life and activities of Jesus, and for the Christian has thus an incomparable charm. It measures 13 miles by 8, is subject to sudden and violent squalls (Mk 4<sup>37</sup>), and swarms with fish. Tarichæa (= "preserving") on the southern edge of the Lake, took its name from the fish-curing industry, of which it was the main centre. On the south-western shore was Tiberias, the new capital of Herod Antipas, built in honour of Tiberius and decked out with a stadium and other Greek splendours. Even Sepphoris was made subordinate to it. In A.D. 61 Nero presented it to Agrippa II., so that it

<sup>1</sup> Jos. *Ant.* 18. 2. 1; cf. *Life*, 45.

had ceased to belong to Galilee at the outbreak of the Jewish war with Rome. After A.D. 70 it became the seat of the Sanhedrin, and ultimately a great school of Rabbinic learning.

Galilee, as a whole, was a thickly populated, stirring, and prosperous region, and in view of the mixed races inhabiting it afforded Jesus a more cosmopolitan field for the propagation of His teaching than was elsewhere to be found within the Holy Land. We are left with the impression of a busy people with little leisure left for the cultivation of the higher life.

Samaria, the smallest of the three Palestinian provinces, lay in the centre of the country, to the south-west of Galilee and to the north-east of Judæa. A mountainous, beautiful, and fertile region, it extended from a point near the Great Sea in a south-easterly direction to the valley of the Jordan. The population was partly Israelitish and partly heathen. From the time of Ezra, when their offer to join in the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem was rejected, the Samaritans became bitterly hostile to the Jews, who on their part refused them all ecclesiastical recognition and treated them as an alien and apostate race. Their territory was designated by the rabbis the land of the Cuthim, and adjudged to be no part of the Holy Land. Reading Gerizim for Ebal in their Pentateuch (Dt 27<sup>4</sup>), the Samaritans erected a rival temple on Mount Gerizim as the place of Jahweh's choice. The cleavage between the two peoples became more and more acute, and was aptly expressed in the proverb, "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans" (Jn 4<sup>9</sup>). Samaritan history circles round the two cities of Neapolis (the ancient Shechem or modern Nablous) finely situated between Ebal and Gerizim, and Samaria, 6 miles to the north-west. The latter city was founded by Omri, and after its demolition by John Hyrcanus was restored by Gabinius and adorned by Herod the Great with many

splendid buildings, in addition to a temple in honour of Augustus. He named it Sebaste (=Augusta), and placed in it a military garrison. In the hot season it became a favourite resort of Roman veterans. Antipathy to the Jews kept the Samaritans from being involved in rebellions against the Roman dominion, and gained for them some remission of taxes.

Judæa was the southern division of Palestine, bounded on the east by the Jordan and the Dead Sea, on the west by the Hellenistic coast towns, on the north by Samaria, and on the south by Idumæa and the Arabian desert. It was inhabited by Jews descended from the captives who returned from Babylon, and partly also by proselytes converted from heathenism to Judaism. Rising from the lowlands on the west to the hill country of the Central Range, it sloped down steeply to the valley of the Jordan on the east. More rugged and sterile than either Galilee or Samaria, it was largely a country of shepherds. The rich luxuriance and palm groves of Jericho, to which many Arabs and Egyptians had been attracted, are in strong contrast both to the bareness of the hill country and to the adjacent wilds associated with the ascetic sect of the Essenes and the emergence of John the Baptist as the herald of the coming kingdom. On the seaboard of the northern border lay Cæsarea (Strato's Tower), originally a colony of Greeks and Syrians, but latterly reinforced by Jewish settlers on its enlargement and adornment by Herod the Great. Previously the official residence of the governor, it became the capital after the catastrophe of A.D. 70.

In a central position, though nearer the Jordan than the Mediterranean, was situated the ancient fortress and city of Jerusalem. Besieged and looted oftener probably than any other stronghold, it now stands upon the deeply accumulated débris of many centuries, and has a population of about 90,000. It is built upon four hills, two on

either side of the Tyropæan valley. The upper town occupied Mount Zion on the west, and the lower the hill Acra to the north of it. To the east, on Mount Moriah, stood the Temple, built of snow-white marble, and the pride of the land. On its southern slope was Mount Ophel, the city of David. To the north-west, adjoining the Temple, and dominating both it and the city generally, was the fortress of Antonia, which was strengthened by Herod and subsequently used as a Roman garrison. The new suburb of Bezetha was built on a lower eminence to the north of Antonia, and first placed within the city by the younger Agrippa.<sup>1</sup> Except on its northern side, Jerusalem is encircled by ravines 300 to 400 feet deep—the valley of the Kidron on the east, and the valley of Hinnom on the south and west. Commercially insignificant, it was the abode of scholars, rabbis, and official ecclesiastics. It owes its unique fame to its rank as “the city of the great King” (Mt 5<sup>35</sup>), specially consecrated to His worship. As such it was the centre of the religious life of the nation, and pre-eminently the “Holy City.”

## (2) *The Inhabitants of Palestine*

The Canaanite occupation of Palestine dates from between 3000 and 2000 B.C., but of the aborigines little is known. Excavations at Gezer, however, have revealed no fewer than seven layers of dwellings piled upon each other, and of these the two lowest have been pronounced by experts to be pre-Canaanite. They were cave dwellings, occupied by people of diminutive stature, acquainted to some extent with the potter's art, and armed with weapons of the Stone Age.<sup>2</sup> In A.D. 1888, at Tell-el-Amarna on the Nile, nearly 200 miles south of

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *B.J.* v. 4. 2.

<sup>2</sup> “In all probability . . . the first settlements at Jerusalem were of Stone-Age men, inhabiting caves.”—Sir G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, i. p. 285.

Cairo, there were unearthed a large number of clay tablets written in the Babylonian cuneiform and containing extracts from the Egyptian State archives belonging to the reigns of the two sovereigns, Amenophis III. and IV. (c. B.C. 1400-1350). These are mostly in the form of letters to the reigning Pharaohs, and include dispatches from Egyptian officials in Syrian and Canaanitish towns. During recent excavations by Sir Flinders Petrie at Tell Fara, in Southern Palestine, "a Roman city was first unearthed and then a Greek one. Beneath were buildings of the Jewish period, and ultimately an Egyptian city was discovered, of date from B.C. 1580-1200, when the Israelites were wandering in the wilderness."<sup>1</sup> Another dispatch from Jerusalem, dated July 19, 1929, and describing the excavation of prehistoric caves at Athlit, near Haifa, states that "the largest cave was found to contain traces of the most complete succession of Stone-Age cultures hitherto found in Palestine."<sup>1</sup> Still more recently it has been reported that scarabs found in 1932 in the Royal tombs of Jericho, and belonging mostly to Hyksos times about B.C. 2400 to the reign of Amenophis III., confirm the evidence of the pottery already found in the burnt city—"that Jericho was destroyed by Joshua during the reign of Amenophis III., B.C. 1413 to B.C. 1377. And the exodus from Egypt therefore took place immediately after the death of Thutmosis III., B.C. 1447, in the reign of Amenophis II." Archæology thus continues to bring to light important facts relative to the pre-Israelitish period.

The Israelites crossed the Jordan at the beginning of the thirteenth century B.C.<sup>3</sup> Their settlement in Palestine was carried out largely at the point of the sword, and it took centuries before the country was welded together in one compact Jewish State. By the time when this was

<sup>1</sup> *The Scots Observer*, July 11, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> *The Scotsman*.

<sup>3</sup> It has now been definitely ascertained that the fall of Jericho took place about B.C. 1400, and that it was destroyed by fire.

effected a notable change had taken place in the life of the people: from being nomads they had become a nation of farmers and merchants. Under the sagacious leadership of Samuel, the loose tribal union developed into a well-compacted kingdom with a written constitution which was preserved in the sanctuary (1 Sam 10<sup>25</sup>). After the rupture of the Davidic kingdom under Rehoboam, both sections of the Hebrew State suffered from foreign invasion. About B.C. 720 the northern kingdom of the Ten Tribes was overrun by the Assyrians, and the flower of the population deported. They were replaced by colonists from other subjugated areas, who in combination with the remanent Israelites formed the composite race of the Samaritans. In B.C. 587 a similar disaster overtook the southern kingdom of Judah. Its king, Zedekiah, having foolishly joined a confederacy with Egypt against Babylon, Nebuchadrezzar besieged and destroyed Jerusalem, and carried away most of the inhabitants. The downfall of the State, however, proved conducive to the spiritual welfare of the chosen people, the return of the exiles by permission of Cyrus the new Lord of Babylon, and under the leadership of Ezra the scribe, being marked by a new-born zeal for Jahweh's house. As they settled down in their ancestral abodes, and fusion took place between them and their neighbours, they unitedly formed a new community in which a pious and disciplined spirit, begotten of adversity, fitted them for their special task of preparing the way of the Lord. They had parted with former illusions and gained in moral strength. The policy pursued by the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser with regard to the northern kingdom necessarily led to a different state of matters there. Men of alien and non-Semitic race had been planted upon Israelitish soil, and they appear to have swamped the Israelitish remnant. In B.C. 164 Judas Maccabæus transferred in a body to Judæa all Jews resident in Gilead (1 Macc 5<sup>23</sup>). Their deportation proved the



smallness of their number, and told advantageously in two directions. It secured them against further molestation by the surrounding pagan population, while also tending to strengthen the Jewish power at the centre. Later on, in B.C. 105-104, Aristobulus, son of John Hyrcanus, reversed this procedure. According to Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 11. 3), he marched against the Ituræans, united a large portion of their land to Judæa, and forced them to undergo circumcision and to observe the practice of the Jewish law. Schürer thinks it likely "that the portion conquered by Aristobulus was mainly Galilee, and that the actual Judaizing of Galilee was first carried out by him."<sup>1</sup> In part at least this helps to explain the mixed character of the population in that northern region.

### (3) *The Common Speech of Palestine*

It would be wrong to infer from the fact that the inscription on the cross of Jesus was written in Greek and Latin and Hebrew (Lk 23<sup>38</sup>; Jn 19<sup>20</sup>) that all three languages had equal vogue in Palestine. Latin was used only in official documents along with a translation into Aramaic,<sup>2</sup> the popular Hebraic dialect of post-exilic times. Greek, however, was not by any means an unknown tongue to many Palestinian Jews. Under the earlier Maccabees Hellenistic influence had been successfully resisted in the sphere of religion, but under the Greek dominion continued to be strongly felt with respect to language, trade, fashions, and customs. Coinage struck by Herod and the Romans bore Greek inscriptions which were no riddle to the people in general (Mt 22<sup>20f.</sup>), and intercourse with the Hellenistic population of the Decapolis, not to mention that of the surrounding regions, necessitated some acquaintance with their language. It has also to be remembered that many

<sup>1</sup> *HJP* i. 1. p. 293 f.

<sup>2</sup> The name is derived from Aram, in OT=Syria.

Greek-speaking Jews from foreign parts flocked to Jerusalem at Feast times, while others who had become domesticated in Palestine were allowed to have their own distinctive synagogues (Ac 6<sup>9</sup>). The disputes between their representatives and Stephen were presumably conducted in Greek. Significantly enough, during the war with Rome, the rabbinic authorities cancelled the liberty formerly granted to Jews resident abroad, to have their sons taught Greek. Both Latin and Greek names were often adopted, and not a few Greek words apparently found their way into the Aramaic speech.<sup>1</sup> In spite of all this, however, Paul's choice of the latter as the medium of his address to the people of Jerusalem, and the impression thus made upon them (Ac 22<sup>2</sup>), shew that their acquaintance with Greek was comparatively limited, and that it was readily understood only in educated circles. There can be little doubt that even in those districts of Palestine where the population was most mixed, and which were most penetrated by Greek influence, Aramaic was the prevailing tongue. Great as the impact of Hellenism upon the language of Palestine undoubtedly was, it never seriously threatened the supremacy of the vernacular. Except in the rabbinical schools, the ancient Hebrew was no longer in general use. It remained merely the official language of religion. Readings from it in the synagogue had to be accompanied by a running translation into Aramaic. Various passages in the Gospels which retain Aramaic words or phrases<sup>2</sup> indicate that this was the language habitually spoken by Jesus and His disciples. The conversations with the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk 7<sup>26</sup>) and with Pilate (Jn 19<sup>9ff.</sup>) have been cited as proof that our Lord was familiar with Hellenistic

<sup>1</sup> For a list of Greek words occurring in the Mishnah (2nd cent. A.D.), see Schürer, *HJP* ii. 1. 22.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *Korban* (Mk 7<sup>11</sup>); *raca* (Mt 5<sup>22</sup>); *rabboni* (Jn 20<sup>16</sup>); *abba* (Mk 14<sup>20</sup>), etc.

Greek,<sup>1</sup> but even those who advance this argument admit that it was not the language in which He habitually, or even frequently, spoke. It is significant that Mark's account of His activities on the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and on the outskirts of the "Ten Cities," should point to His having there used the Aramaic dialect, and also that at the hour of death, He expressed Himself in His native speech (Mt 27<sup>46</sup> ; Mk 15<sup>34</sup>).

#### (4) Courts of Justice

The supreme Jewish tribunal known as the Sanhedrin originated in the Greek period as the Synedrion or Gerousia, an aristocratic council (*Boulē*) of elders<sup>2</sup> associated with the high-priest in the government of the nation. There is no record of its formal creation, nor any definite statement regarding its constitution. According to Josephus, it was "an aristocracy with an oligarchy,"<sup>3</sup> and it was probably in force at Jerusalem before B.C. 200.<sup>4</sup> What is certain is that it gradually developed into the great Sanhedrin,<sup>5</sup> which had its seat in Jerusalem. Modelled on the Mosaic council of elders (Num 11<sup>16</sup>), it was composed of seventy-one members (seventy and a president)—chief priests (the priestly and Sadducæan nobility), elders, and scribes (the Pharisaic doctors). During the Herodian period the Sanhedrin, though led by the high-priests, was virtually dominated by the Pharisees. "It represented as a public court all that

<sup>1</sup> Muirhead, *The Times of Christ*, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> In the Septuagint these are sometimes termed presbuteroi, archontes, or archēgoi. 1 Maccabees makes the Gerousia synonymous with the elders and rulers of the people (12<sup>5</sup>, 13<sup>36</sup>, 14<sup>20</sup>). "The elders of the Jews" are mentioned by Josephus in connexion with the reign of Alexandra (*Ant.* xiii. 16. 5), and "their senate" in *Ant.* xii. 3. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ant.* xi. 4. 8.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Macc 12<sup>6</sup> ; 2 Macc 1<sup>10</sup>, 4<sup>44</sup>, 11<sup>27</sup> ; Judith 4<sup>8</sup>, 11<sup>14</sup>, 15<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> On the probable course of its growth, see G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, i. p. 393 ff.

was left the people of executive power and self-government." <sup>1</sup> Usually, if not indeed always, its president was the hereditary high-priest for the time being (Ac 23<sup>5</sup>). To him it fell to summon and conduct the assembly, which on occasion might meet in his palace (Mt 26<sup>3</sup>), <sup>2</sup> but as a rule its sittings were held in a special courthouse (Lishkath-hag-Gazith) within the Temple precincts, and probably on the Temple Mount itself. No courts were held on sabbaths or on festival days. Otherwise it met daily, twenty-three members forming a quorum. The members sat in a semicircle, the president in the centre. In front of them sat two clerks, who recorded the votes, and three rows of scholars cultivating acquaintance with the law and qualifying themselves for being chosen to fill vacancies in the membership. Supporting the president were a vice-president and other distinguished officials. During the sittings of the court its bailiffs (*hyperetai*) were in attendance and acted as its messengers (Jn 7<sup>32, 45</sup>).

By the time of Hyrcanus I. (B.C. 135-104) the Sanhedrin appears to have been reorganized into an assembly of national representatives, so that the high-priest no longer ranked as both the civil and the religious governor of Jerusalem. Its jurisdiction was in theory at least confined to Judæa, but under the Maccabees its fiat extended to the whole of Palestine, and afterwards even to the regions beyond (Ac 9<sup>2</sup>). The same practice prevailed under the Roman dominion, which avoided interference with local institutions that were not detrimental to imperial interests. The Sanhedrin, however, though it could pronounce, had no power to carry out the death-sentence. For this, ratification by the Procurator

<sup>1</sup> Hausrath, *NT Times*, i. p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer (*HJP* ii. 1. 23) thinks the resort to the high-priest's palace on this occasion was merely due to the meeting having taken place during the night when the gates of the Temple were shut.

was essential,<sup>1</sup> as the Jews themselves recognized (Jn 18<sup>81</sup>), when, after the death of Herod, who had made it his tool, the Sanhedrin began to function once more. It is significant that in the case of the condemnation of Jesus, Pilate chose to frame his judgement in conformity with Jewish law.

Although to some extent limited by the authority of the Roman procurator, the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin was comprehensive and widespread. Along with its administrative functions it exercised supreme judicial power. It dealt with all matters affecting public worship and the festivals, and with questions concerning the proper interpretation of disputed passages of Scripture; but problems legal as well as theological came before it for judicial decision, *e.g.* questions concerning betrothal, marriage, divorce, and succession to property. Before this judgement-seat, too, were hailed Jesus, charged with blasphemy (Mt 26<sup>65</sup>; Jn 19<sup>7</sup>); Peter and John with misleading the people by preaching the resurrection of the dead (Ac 4-5); Stephen with being a blasphemer (Ac 6<sup>13ff.</sup>); and Paul with heretical teaching and violation of a temple by-law (Ac 21<sup>28</sup>, 23<sup>6-9</sup>). Accused persons were heard (Jn 19<sup>9ff.</sup>), witnesses for the prosecution were called, and punishment, usually by fines, scourging, or imprisonment (Ac 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>18</sup>), was decreed for the condemned. Cases of capital punishment stood in a category apart.

The conjunction of the terms *synedrion* and *gerousia* <sup>2</sup> in Ac 5<sup>21</sup> does not imply that there were *two* tribunals, *gerousia* being there probably merely explicative of *synedrion* in the interest of Gentile readers. There is

<sup>1</sup> The apparent exception of the stoning of Stephen is explicable either as a case of "lynching" by the populace, or of irregular action on the part of the synedrion in the procurator's absence from Jerusalem. Cf. the parallel instance of the execution of the Apostle James recorded by Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 9. 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Presbyterion* is also sometimes used as an equivalent for *gerousia* (Lk 22<sup>66</sup>; Ac 22<sup>5</sup>).

no valid ground for Adolf Büchler's contention that there were two judicial assemblies—one dealing with religious, and the other with civil affairs.<sup>1</sup> No such clear-cut distinction can be drawn. The term *synedrion* as expressly applied to the High Court of Judæa first occurs in the account given by Josephus of Herod's dramatic appearance before it in B.C. 47 or 46. Gabinius (B.C. 57–55) had previously divided the Jewish territory into five synedria, three of which (those of Jerusalem, Gadara, and Jericho) belonged to Judæa proper, but in B.C. 57 a new arrangement was made by Cæsar, whereby Hyrcanus II. had his previous office of Ethnarch restored to him, and the authority of the Council of Jerusalem was again extended to Galilee.<sup>2</sup> Under Archelaus and the Maccabees, however, its jurisdiction was once more limited to Judæa proper. In NT times it is represented as the supreme Jewish court of justice.<sup>3</sup> With the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Sanhedrin naturally ceased to exist.

Besides the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem there were small local courts or municipal councils of seven members in every town and village of Palestine. In larger towns they numbered twenty-three. They met at "the gate," and disposed of all causes not involving capital punishment.<sup>4</sup> To them it also belonged to supervise the police, and to arrange for the conduct of worship in the synagogue. These local sanhedrins were thus courts of law, municipal councils, and ecclesiastical judicatories all in one. Delinquents were punished by flogging (Mt 10<sup>17</sup>; Mk 13<sup>9</sup>) or imprisonment, by exclusion from

<sup>1</sup> *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem*, etc. (Wien, 1902).

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. 9. 3–5.

<sup>3</sup> Mt 5<sup>22</sup>, 26<sup>59</sup>; Mk 14<sup>55</sup>, 15<sup>1</sup>; Lk 22<sup>66</sup>; Ac 4<sup>15</sup>, 5<sup>21ff.</sup>, etc.

<sup>4</sup> The action of "all" in the synagogue of Nazareth, including therefore the local sanhedrin, in attempting to put Jesus to death (Lk 4<sup>29</sup>) was distinctly *ultra vires*, although it was given a semblance of legality, since hurling from a precipice was considered a form of stoning, the legal penalty for blasphemy.

the synagogue, or by being sent in fetters to the high court in Jerusalem.

### (5) *Trade and Industry*

*Rural Life.*—With their occupation of Palestine the Hebrews became, like the Canaanites before them, an agricultural people. The whole life of the peasant was bound up with the land. In the imagery and especially in the parables of our Lord we get a graphic picture of rural conditions. The sower scattering his seed, men and oxen at the plough, stewards and caretakers for absentee landlords, women grinding at the mill, labourers in vineyards and barns, the shepherd tending his flock—all clearly reflect the activities of a farming and pastoral population. Apart from rocky and mountainous stretches in Judæa, the soil was well tilled. Although the implements used were of a primitive description, climatic conditions ensured good crops. Besides wheat and barley, olives, palms, and vines were largely cultivated. It is interesting to learn that since the inception of the Zionist movement many places in Palestine which had become deserts under Turkish rule have once more begun to blossom as the rose. According to Colonel John Buchan, M.P., it is to-day "one of the few bright spots on the dismal map of the globe." In the times of Christ grain was threshed in the open field, the corn being trodden out by oxen. Tall vines clustered round the stems of fig trees; hence the expression "dwelling under one's own vine and fig tree."<sup>1</sup> Due heed was paid to legal requirements such as keeping the ground fallow in the seventh year, the leaving of a corner of the field for the poor, and the consecration of a tithe of the harvest.<sup>2</sup> At the time of vintage grapes were trodden by the gatherers in the wine-press which was placed in the carefully enclosed and well-guarded vineyard. Husbandry

<sup>1</sup> 1 Ki 4<sup>26</sup>; Mic 4<sup>4</sup>; Zec 3<sup>10</sup>; 1 Macc 14<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 167 f.

was greatly dependent on "the early and latter rain" (Ja 5<sup>7</sup>), which fell respectively from about the middle of October till November, and from March till the middle of April. The animals most in request were the ox and the ass (Ex 20<sup>17</sup>; Lk 14<sup>5</sup>), though camels must also have been in use (Mk 10<sup>25</sup>; cf. Mt 3<sup>4</sup>, 23<sup>24</sup>). Country life included the pastoral as well as the agricultural element. A section of the population gained a subsistence by herding their flocks of sheep and goats on the hills and undulating plains which are the principal features of the landscape. Sheep were extensively reared and jealously guarded from wolves and other wild beasts.<sup>1</sup> Dogs roamed about the streets of towns and villages, but were held in general contempt, as, of course, were also swine.

*Commerce.*—Tilling of the soil and the manufacture of goods were naturally accompanied by the process of buying and selling. Substantial trading in ropes was carried on at Arbel, near the Lake of Galilee, in indigo and dyes at Magdala on its western shore, and in linen at Scythopolis. At Tarichæa there was a busy fish-market, and a considerable traffic in boats and nets. Those engaged in the fishing industry appear to have generally succeeded in gaining a competent livelihood (Mt 19<sup>27</sup>). Cattle-rearing in Samaria yielded lucrative results, as did likewise palm-growing and the cultivation of balsam at Jericho. In southern Judæa the culture of the vine and the raising of fat lambs for sacrifice proved profitable industries. Timber from the hills about Jerusalem, figs from Bethphage, grapes from Heshbon, and olives from the mount called by their name, were all marketable commodities. The pearl merchant too, intent upon the acquisition of gain, represents another form of lucrative trading. As the great centre of the national life Jerusalem attracted workmen of every type, and various bazaars catered for their wants. Sellers

<sup>1</sup> Ps 23<sup>4</sup>; Jn 10<sup>11, 12, 15</sup>; Mt 7<sup>15</sup>.



of animals, oil, etc., for the Temple offerings found their merchandize in constant demand. Another industry incidental to the life of the Holy City was that of those who provided accommodation for the endless stream of visitors to the sacred shrine. At feast-times especially these would reap a golden harvest.

*Handicraft.*—Among the Jews of Palestine industrial labour kept pace with agricultural pursuits. The only skilled workmen named in the NT<sup>1</sup> are Joseph the carpenter, Simon the tanner, and Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla, the weavers of tent-cloth. Josephus and the Talmudists, however, furnish not a few details respecting industrial life in the Holy Land. Contact with the Phœnicians had enabled the Israelitish settlers to become proficient as builders, and skilled artisans were in general demand. The esteem in which labour was held is attested by the rule that every Jewish lad should learn a trade. The writer of Ecclesiasticus speaks of the artificer and the workmaster, the engraver of signets, the smith by the anvil, and the potter anxiously set at his work. Without these, he adds, "no city could be inhabited: they maintain the fabric of the world" (38<sup>27ff.</sup>). There were also fullers and tanners, weavers and fishers, dyers and workers in iron and copper in mines east of the Jordan. Certain callings were in bad odour either as exposing those who followed them to obvious temptations, or because of the evil repute of those engaged in them. In the former category were placed perfumers, wool-carders, and bath-heaters; in the latter ass-drivers, butchers, and pedlars. Domestic servants were given a place in the family, and were commonly treated with the kindly consideration required by the precept: "Beware of eating fine bread thyself, and giving thy servant black."<sup>2</sup> Under the Herods

<sup>1</sup> Demetrius the silversmith (Ac 19<sup>24</sup>) and Alexander the copper-smith (2 Tim 4<sup>14</sup>) do not, of course, come into the reckoning.

<sup>2</sup> *Kiddushin*, 20a.

thousands of workmen—architects and sculptors, as well as masons, carpenters, and other mechanics—were employed in the rebuilding of the Temple. The folding doors of the sacred edifice were overlaid with gold and silver, and the eastern gate (the Gate Beautiful, Ac 3<sup>10</sup>) was hung with embroidered curtains, over which was emblazoned a golden vine as a symbol of Divine favour (cf. Ps 80<sup>8</sup>). Internally the buildings were lavishly adorned with trophies captured in war. Altogether, in spite of the ban put upon the painter's brush, the Temple of Jerusalem was "a magnificent monument of the unsurpassable love of art peculiar to the workmen of Palestine."<sup>1</sup>

The ranks of Jewish artisans were already permeated by the spirit of trade unionism. This appears to have been imported from Egypt. Jewish coppersmiths in Alexandria were organized as a guild: special seats in the synagogue were allocated to the various orders of craftsmen, while workmen out of employment were supported by their fellows. So also in Palestine at the commencement of the Christian era members of a particular trade were banded together for mutual advantage and succour.<sup>2</sup> Thus if through no fault of his own an ass-driver lost his ass, or a waterman his boat, the lost property was replaced by the corporation of which he was a member.

It is relevant here to recall the emphasis with which Paul in his Epistles urges his readers to "work with their own hands" (1 Thess 4<sup>11</sup>). In view of his declination to accept the payment to which he was entitled as a Christian minister, and of his reliance upon his own handiwork for his maintenance, he had earned the right to say: "Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the

<sup>1</sup> Delitzsch, *Jewish Artisan Life*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> "There was, e.g. a peculiar train of thought and mode of speech, which was called the 'Fullers' Sayings.'"—Delitzsch, *op. cit.* p. 50.

thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth " (Eph 4<sup>28</sup>), and to declare that " if any man will not work, neither should he eat " (2 Thess 3<sup>10</sup>). Nor must it be forgotten that handicraft is inseparably bound up with the person of Jesus. That the Saviour of the world belonged to a workman's family is the indefeasible consecration of labour and of the honourable task of socially useful industry.

#### (6) *Domestic Life and Manners*

*Housing.*—As a rule dwelling-houses in Palestine were of a very primitive character. In towns they were frequently built of brick, but in the country usually of wattles covered with clay, and perhaps white-washed. A few rich people occupied luxurious and well-appointed abodes, but the poverty-stricken masses lived in one-roomed houses that were small, bare, without windows, and comfortless. House rents ranged from about 7s. to £9 a year. The furniture of an ordinary artisan's dwelling consisted mainly of a lamp, a wooden chest placed in a recess of the wall, a stool for holding the large tray on which was set the dish for the common meal, some earthenware vessels, a few wine-skins, a bushel, a hand-mill, a broom, and a Mesusah or oblong box hung over the door and containing a parchment scroll on which were inscribed the two portions of the law bearing on love to God (Dt 4<sup>4-9</sup>) and the blessings attending obedience to the commandments (Dt 11<sup>13-21</sup>). The larger houses stood in a little courtyard with posterns opening into the street and outside staircases leading to the roof. In favourable weather it was usual to sleep on the roof, which was also utilized as a place of retirement in hours of grief,<sup>1</sup> as a post of observation,<sup>2</sup> and as a retreat for teachers and pupils.<sup>3</sup> It was indeed put to a great variety of uses. A convenient stage for public proclama-

<sup>1</sup> Pr 21<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Is 22<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *Shabbath* 1. *Halac* 7; cf. Ac 20<sup>8</sup>.

tions,<sup>1</sup> it also provided the husbandman with safe storage for fruit, flax, or grain. At the Feast of Tabernacles booths were placed on the roofs, and it was also customary to lay out corpses there previous to interment. In such an upper chamber Jesus healed the paralytic who was ushered into His presence by being let down through the easily removable tiling.<sup>2</sup>

*Food and Dress.*—The staple food of the poor was barley (2 Ki 4<sup>42</sup>), and that of the well-to-do wheaten bread. Washing of the hands was the usual preliminary to a meal, and had a religious significance, especially among the Essenes, as a symbol of purification. The principal meal was taken at midday (1 Ki 20<sup>16</sup>; Ac 10<sup>9f.</sup>). After giving of thanks, the head of the house, occupying the central place, handed out their portions to the several guests (1 Sam 1<sup>4</sup>), who ate in a reclining posture. During the meal the door stood open, and any passer-by might come in from the street or even share in the conversation (Lk 7<sup>36f.</sup>). At the conclusion of the repast the benediction prescribed by the law (Dt 8<sup>10</sup>) was pronounced. According to the Mishnah (*Berachoth* vii.), this was still the practice in NT times. "Of what, then, did the midday meal of a middle-class house in Jerusalem consist in the first century? Of fish from the lake, locusts baked in flour or honey, onions, butcher's meat. For drinks, there was the beer of Media, or wine mingled with water, and for dessert the cheapest fruits were grapes and figs. The poor had to live more moderately. The lake-fishermen in particular rarely tasted meat; bread, hard-boiled eggs, and the produce of their fishing, with locusts and water, formed the staple of their daily food."<sup>3</sup>

Both sexes wore a linen under-garment or tunic, and over it a mantle probably similar to that worn in Pales-

<sup>1</sup> Mt 10<sup>27</sup>; Lk 12<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Mk 2<sup>4</sup>; Lk 5<sup>19</sup>. Cf. Ac 1<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, p. 188 f.

tine to-day, and consisting of "two pieces of cloth sewn on three sides, so that they form a sort of bag turned inside out with a hole in the middle for the head, and two holes at the side for the arms."<sup>1</sup> It could readily be thrown off to facilitate quick movement (Mt 5<sup>40</sup>). The mantle, which was fastened by a girdle round the waist (2 Ki 1<sup>8</sup>, 4<sup>29</sup>), was in the case of women specially wide and flowing, and many passages of Scripture speak of it as a capacious pocket.<sup>2</sup> A man's dress cost from £3 to £6, but the price of a lady's cloak might amount to £30 or £40. Priests wore white linen and short breeches; court servants had also a special uniform (1 Ki 10<sup>5</sup>; Is 22<sup>21</sup>); and the military colour was red (Judg 8<sup>26</sup>; Is 63<sup>1</sup>). The mantle was properly white, but gay clothing was much in vogue in ancient Israel, and was still so much affected in apostolic times as to incur the censure of Peter (1 Pet 3<sup>3</sup>) and (?) Paul (1 Tim 2<sup>9</sup>). Another practice which had previously drawn down the rebuke of our Lord was that of an ostentatious piety flaunting itself under the guise of a distinctive garb (Mt 23<sup>5</sup>; Lk 20<sup>46</sup>). Both men and women wore turbans as a protection from the sun, and for footgear light shoes or strong sandals. Changes of raiment were much prized,<sup>3</sup> and often bestowed as presents by kings and magnates.<sup>4</sup> Women carried scent bottles, and were fond of scenting their clothes.<sup>5</sup> Mourning garments were of coarse material, and worn by prophets and ascetics like John the Baptist, whose raiment was of camel's hair (Mt 3<sup>4</sup>). In this practice, as Gesenius remarks, we see an anticipation of monkish dress.<sup>6</sup> Women were usually veiled in public. They used cosmetics for eyes and eyebrows, but in this were

<sup>1</sup> Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> Ruth 3<sup>15</sup>; Pr 17<sup>23</sup>; 2 Ki 4<sup>39</sup>; Hag 2<sup>12</sup>; Lk 6<sup>38</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Gn 41<sup>14</sup>; 1 Sam 28<sup>8</sup>; 2 Sam 12<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Est 6<sup>8ff.</sup>; 1 Sam 18<sup>4</sup>; 2 Ki 5<sup>5</sup>. Cf. Judg 14<sup>12, 19</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Ps 45<sup>8</sup>; Song of Sol 4<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> *Com. on Isaiah*, i. p. 644.

no worse than Herod, who, "to cover his great age, dyed his hair." <sup>1</sup> If they surpassed men in their fondness for jewellery and personal adornment (Is 3<sup>20</sup>), the men appear to have been equally set upon wearing a signet ring (Gn 41<sup>42</sup>; Jer 22<sup>24</sup>). Men and women alike placed a high value upon bushy locks (Song of Sol 5<sup>11</sup>), and even to children a bald head was a subject for mockery (2 Ki 2<sup>23</sup>).

*Weddings, Funerals, and Salutations.*—Apart from the blessing of relatives and friends (Gn 24<sup>60</sup>) there was no religious ceremony at a marriage. Amid demonstrations of joy the bride was taken by her relatives from her father's house to that of her husband, unless the bridegroom came for the purpose himself (Mt 25<sup>1ff.</sup>). She went forth wearing a crown,<sup>2</sup> and adorned with jewels. As marriages were celebrated at sunset, the bride's maiden friends, who waved myrtle branches over her head, each carried a lamp. To the accompaniment of music and dancing they proceeded to the marriage feast, the guests being each provided with a wedding garment (Mt 22<sup>11</sup>). The festivities were prolonged for seven days among the "sons of the bride-chamber," namely, the friends of the bridegroom, while the bridegroom was yet with them (Mt 9<sup>14ff.</sup> and pls.).

A dead body was laid in an upper chamber (Ac 9<sup>37</sup>), wrapped in linen, perfumed with spices (Mt 27<sup>59</sup>; Jn 19<sup>40</sup>), and placed upon a bier (Lk 7<sup>14</sup>). This was carried on the shoulders of the bearers, and followed by the bereaved, whose loud lamentations were supplemented by the shrill cries of professional mourners hired for the occasion (Am 5<sup>10</sup>). As in the case of marriages, there was no religious service. After the burial relatives partook together of "funeral food" (Ezek 24<sup>17. 22</sup>), and friends came to express sympathy with the bereaved (Jn 11<sup>19</sup>), who, however, were always the first to speak

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xvi. 8. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek 16<sup>11-13</sup>. Cf. Is 61<sup>10</sup>; Jer 2<sup>32</sup>.

(Job 2<sup>13, 31</sup>). Sackcloth was worn by mourners for at least seven and frequently for thirty days.<sup>1</sup> From the Gospels we learn that, curiously enough, children were allowed to play in the market-place at funerals as well as weddings (Mt 11<sup>16</sup> ; Lk 7<sup>32</sup>).

Travellers on the Palestinian highways were wont to gird up their loins (Lk 12<sup>35</sup>) so as not to be impeded by the folds of their long robes. The girdle was also used as a purse. In addition to this, it was customary to carry a wallet, stocked probably with food, oil, and wine, and to greet those met with on the way with the salutation "Hail," or "Peace be with you" (Lk 24<sup>36</sup> ; Jn 20<sup>26</sup>). To a friend a Jew would also say, "Blessed be thy mother" (Lk 11<sup>27</sup>), but upon an enemy or a Samaritan he would invoke a corresponding curse. It may seem strange that Jesus directed his disciples to "salute no man by the way" (Lk 10<sup>4</sup>), but the injunction must be interpreted in the light of the full meaning attached to the word "greet." Like the modern Arabic equivalent *Gällām*, it meant not merely "salute," but also "visit." The disciples had something more important to do than to turn into acquaintances to be their guests. Hence the further admonition, "Go not from house to house" (Lk 10<sup>7</sup>). Certainly it is not to be thought that a friendly greeting on passing upon the open road was forbidden by our Lord. His instructions simply meant that in view of the urgency of their mission they were not to loiter by the way and waste their valuable time in the manner indicated.

### (7) Social Conditions

*Riches and Poverty.*—While under Herod's rule Palestine clearly enjoyed much material prosperity, the costs of his extensive building enterprises, of his pay-

<sup>1</sup> For further details on this subject, see Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 1070 ff.

ments to Rome, and of his lavish gifts to foreign cities, were met only by oppressive taxation. In this way, as was represented by an embassy sent to Rome after his death, the Jewish inhabitants had been cruelly impoverished. Many owners of property had even been put to death and their estates confiscated. Nor did matters improve under direct Roman government by reason of the rapacity of imperial officials, whose venality became a scandal. Of Varus, *e.g.* a Roman writer pointedly said: "A poor man he entered the rich country, a rich man he left the country poor." Practically the only opulent people were either foreigners or Jews who as usurers or extortionate tax-collectors had piled up wealth. Moral defects on the part of the people themselves were no doubt contributory causes to their misery. The pages of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus reflect the presence of idleness, drunkenness, the pursuit of pleasure, and other vices subversive of the national well-being. The Gospels reveal the existence of both wealth and poverty in the time of our Lord—rich magnates clothed in purple and fine linen side by side with ulcerous cringing beggars at their gates (Lk 16<sup>20ff.</sup>). During a severe famine in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of his reign, Herod, because of the prevailing pestilence, want, and misery, felt constrained to sell furniture and plate from his palace to relieve the widespread distress. Even in normal circumstances the mass of the population were scarcely above the poverty line. "The poor you have always with you," said Jesus, and his words accurately sum up the social situation in His time.

Remedial measures were limited to almsgiving, no other solution seems ever to have been suggested. It took various forms. The old regulation giving leave to the poor to eat grapes at pleasure and to appropriate ungleaned corners of the fields was still in force (Dt 23<sup>24f.</sup>; Mt 12<sup>1</sup>). In the Dispersion systematic collections were



made not only for the local poor, but also for indigent Jews in Palestine (Ac 6<sup>1</sup>). Official almoners were appointed—two as receivers and three as distributors.<sup>1</sup> Alms-chests, too, were set in places of worship.<sup>2</sup> In terms of the Deuteronomic law the sanctuary tithe or first-fruit had every third year to be devoted to the assistance of the local poor and kindred objects, instead of being taken to Jerusalem for the priests. Though almsgiving did not always proceed from motives of charity, but often engendered a spirit of self-righteousness (Lk 18<sup>12</sup>), it was reckoned a prime virtue. In Dan 4<sup>27</sup> the counsel, "Make an end of your sins by practising justice and shewing pity to the oppressed," already suggests that alms had reputably a redemptive power. This idea finds more definite expression in the OT Apocrypha, the general term righteousness being identified with almsgiving in particular. Thus in Eccus 29<sup>12</sup> it is said, "It shall deliver thee from all affliction," and in Tob 4<sup>10</sup> that it "delivereth from death." Rabbinic Judaism also taught that "through alms a man partakes of eternal life."

*Education.*—Among the Jews education in the modern sense was scarcely known. Few could even read and write. A certain acquaintance with plants and animals is suggested in Scripture.<sup>3</sup> Like that of the ancients in general, their astronomical and geographical knowledge was of a very primitive type. They knew certain constellations (Job 9<sup>9</sup>; Am 5<sup>8</sup>), and regarded the earth as a circular plane (Is 40<sup>22</sup>). With the exception of Babylon, the world outside of their own land they called "the region of the sea."<sup>4</sup> Their medical knowledge was quite unscientific. Sickness was viewed as a punishment for the sins of the victim or of his kindred (Jn 5<sup>14</sup>, 9<sup>2</sup>. 34), and was thought to be induced by evil spirits.<sup>5</sup> Demons

<sup>1</sup> *Peah*, viii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Vitranga, *Syn. Vet.* iii.

<sup>3</sup> Gn 1<sup>21</sup>; Pr 6<sup>8ff.</sup>; Job 39<sup>5-30</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *Baba Bathra*, 74. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Mt 9<sup>32f.</sup>, 12<sup>22</sup>; Lk 13<sup>11</sup>. 16.

were exorcised by magical incantations.<sup>1</sup> The sick were anointed with oil.<sup>2</sup> The Jews seem to have had no written music. Their simple melodies were usually sung to instrumental accompaniment, to the sound of which they were also fond of dancing. Some fifteen instruments<sup>3</sup> are named in the Bible, but many of them were specially destined for the Temple music. They liked instruments with loud clanging tones, and antiphonal songs. Although singers and players sometimes performed separately (Ps 68<sup>25</sup>), this was not usual. There were men's and women's choirs, and songs with an answering chorus, *e.g.* "The women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands" (Ex 15<sup>20</sup>; 1 Sam 18<sup>7</sup>). Refrains were oft-repeated, as in Ps 136, "For His mercy endureth for ever" (cf. 2 Chron 5<sup>13</sup>; Neh 12<sup>40, 42</sup>).

Schools for children were a post-exilic institution. The name given to the first school opened in Jerusalem—"the house of the book"—by the brother of Queen Alexandra in B.C. 74 indicates the nature of the instruction given. A child learned to recite and then to read Scripture texts (2 Tim 3<sup>15</sup>), and at the age of twelve, became "a son of the law." If any one aimed at becoming a rabbi, he had to qualify in the schools of the Scribes. It was not till A.D. 64 that primary schools were ordered to be established in every township. Such as it was, education was highly prized. According to the rabbis, "Jerusalem was destroyed because the instruction of the young was neglected." They further declared that "the breath of school children is the safeguard of the state," and that "even to rebuild the Temple the schools must not be closed."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sanh.* xi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Mk 6<sup>13</sup>; Lk 10<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> For particulars regarding musical instruments, see G. Robinson Lees, *Village Life in Palestine* (1911).

*Shabbath*, 119b.

*Slavery.*—Among Israelites, most of whom were engaged in agricultural work, the different classes were less sharply divided than is the case in the modern world. Slaves were members of the family, and though they had no civil rights their condition was not oppressive. On the latter point the son of Sirach seems indeed to speak with two voices, on the one hand declaring that "for an evil servant there are racks and tortures" (33<sup>26</sup>), and on the other hand, laying down the rule, "If thou hast a servant, treat him as thyself" (33<sup>30</sup>). Apparently, while in field and house service a slave had to work hard (Job 7<sup>2</sup>; Sir 33<sup>27</sup>), his lot was far more bearable than that of a Roman slave. He shared in the rest of the seventh day as well as in family rejoicings (Dt 12<sup>12</sup>), and in the event of his obtaining his freedom was not sent away destitute (Dt 15<sup>13</sup>). He might even marry a daughter of the house (1 Chron 2<sup>35</sup>).

A distinction was made between Israelitish slaves and those of foreign origin, secured as war booty or by purchase<sup>1</sup> in the neighbouring Phœnician markets (Am 1<sup>5</sup>). Foreigners were slaves in perpetuity, but they, too, were received into the family and adopted the religion of their master (Gn 24<sup>12</sup>, etc.), whose possession their children also became. Though an Israelite who had fallen into poverty might sell himself to another, he could not be compelled to serve as a bond-servant, but only as a hired servant for six years. If in the seventh year he chose to remain in his master's house rather than resume his independence, his ear was bored as a badge of perpetual slavery (Ex 21<sup>6</sup>; Dt 15<sup>17</sup>). "The limitation of the time of service by the year of jubilee results only from the comparison of the law in Leviticus," which "proceeds on the pre-supposition that the servant will live till the time of liberation—till the

<sup>1</sup> The price of a foreign slave was thirty, that of an Israelitic slave fifty shekels of silver (Ex 21<sup>32</sup>; Lev 27<sup>3</sup>).

year of jubilee." <sup>1</sup> A freeman might serve as a slave for a period as the price of his betrothed (cf. Jacob's seven years' service, Gn 29<sup>18</sup>). To kill a slave was a punishable crime, and if under chastisement he lost an eye or a tooth he had to be set free (Ex 21<sup>20, 26f.</sup>).

The Jewish congregation at Rome consisted largely of liberated slaves. All slavery was repudiated by the Essenes as an outrage against the natural equality of men. Jesus, however, never spoke of its abolition. Just as with regard to many other social reforms, so concerning this. He was content to teach principles, the application of which would gradually bring about amelioration and a willingness to sacrifice selfish considerations to the Divine will.

## 2. JEWISH RELIGIOUS LIFE AT THE TIME OF CHRIST

The prime requisite for a true understanding of the religion of the Jews at the time of Christ's advent is a knowledge of the OT revelation contained in the Prophetic books, the Law, and the Hagiographa ("sacred writings"). As the Bible of the contemporary Jews, this was to them the depository of the religion which they deemed to be peculiarly their own. At this time, in recoil from certain aspects of the prevailing form of their religion, many were disposed to revert to the standpoint of bygone days. Jesus Himself frequently contrasted the Judaism current in His time with the religion of Israel, and in particular laid stress upon the teaching of the ancient prophets; and just as a knowledge of the OT is indispensable to a proper understanding of Jewish religion at the time of the Advent, it is equally so to an understanding of Jesus Himself. It was His Bible as

<sup>1</sup> Oehler, *Theol. of the OT*, i. pp. 358, 360. The regulations connected with the year of jubilee remained largely a dead letter, but the idea enshrined in them, namely, that one Israelite could not really enslave another because this was incompatible with his position as a theocratic burgher, persisted and prevailed.

well as theirs. He lived in its atmosphere. Apart from the OT it is impossible to understand either His attitude to the Law or His position as the prophet of Nazareth in whose final revelation of God "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" had their ideals all fulfilled. The same thing holds good with regard to the teaching of Paul: it is inextricably interwoven with the structure of the OT.

Basic as it was, the OT does not of itself give an adequate idea of Jewish religion at the commencement of the Christian era, for the simple reason that chronologically its contents fall considerably short of that date. The latest of the canonical writings: Daniel, Esther, and several Psalms—belong to the second century B.C. Obviously, therefore, they yield no information concerning the interval which separates the close of a long religious development from Judaism as it existed in the first century A.D. From a comparison of the latest canonical books with the conditions then obtaining it is manifest, however, that a notable development of Jewish religion had taken place after the Maccabæan revolt. In this connexion accordingly the Jewish literature produced between that great turning-point of post-exilic Judaism and the dawn of the Christian era assumes capital importance. On its character and scope, see below (p. 126 ff.).

Although Jewish civil and religious life were really one and indivisible, their national life being but a phase of their religion, it is convenient nevertheless to consider separately the spiritual side of their corporate existence. As will be pointed out more particularly at a later stage, the Jews succeeded in building up over a wide area a great and impressive spiritual unity which growingly asserted itself as a menacing and victorious force. Not, however, that this ecclesiastical unity was disturbed by no internal differences. Nor were these confined to occult sympathies; at least in Palestine, which remained the centre of gravity of Judaism, they

found definite outward expression. There was diversity in unity. The nature and extent of this diversity are reflected broadly in the growing transference from priests to theologians of the ruling influence in church life, and also in well-marked differences which crystallized into the group life represented by the Jewish "parties" of the period. In this connexion we note as matters demanding special consideration :

(1) *The Priesthood and the Temple Services*

At the dawn of the Christian era Jewish national life was once more centred in Palestine with the Herodian temple as its headquarters. To the resplendent and only legitimate sanctuary Jewish pilgrims from afar proudly brought their gifts, and in its sacrificial worship paid homage to the God of their fathers. Twenty-four courses of priests—all sons of Aaron, set apart by a special act of consecration, and broken up into a number of divisions and subdivisions, each presided over by a head—officiated by weekly rotation at the regular services. Among these the first of the twenty-four classes, that of Joarib (1 Macc 2<sup>1</sup>), to which the Hasmonaeans belonged, enjoyed the highest reputation, and by the beginning of the Roman dominion formed an exclusive aristocracy, with a social position far above that of the ordinary priests. The office of the high-priest, which was hereditary and held for life, was one of singular elevation, authority, and influence. Invested with both civic and religious primacy, its occupants were princes as well as priests, and from the time of Simon the Maccabee not only wore the priest's mitre but also reigned as kings. Although under the Romans and Herodian princes they were shorn of much of their power and prestige, the high-priests retained no small measure of predominance until the demolition of the Temple—a result of their sacred prerogatives, combined with their political standing and enormous wealth. As at once the civil and sacred heads

of the community, the high-priests exercised supreme authority, and even in post-Maccabaeen times acted as presidents of the Sanhedrin. Except at festal ceremonies, they did not officiate. On the great Day of Atonement it fell to them to offer the sin-offering (Lev 16), and latterly at all events to offer the daily sacrifice during the week preceding that annual celebration. It became customary for them to officiate also on sabbaths, at new moons, and other festivals. Surrounded by a halo of sanctity, revered because of their high estate, and resplendent in their official attire, the high-priests held a position somewhat analogous to that of a modern Pope.<sup>1</sup> Next to the high-priest ranked the Segan or captain of the Temple (Ac 4<sup>1</sup>, etc.), to whom was committed the general oversight of the sanctuary. Important functionaries were also the treasurers, who administered the priestly revenues, and the watchmen, who kept the gates. To other officials still were entrusted the charge of the psalmody and the priestly garments.

At the daily service the twenty-four divisions of the priests and the Levites took part by rotation. Apart from the girdle, the priest's official dress was all white—an emblem of purity. The principal part of the worship consisted of the people's daily burnt-offering. With this was conjoined the daily meat-offering of the high-priest, furnished at his own cost, but usually offered by the priests acting for the time being. It was likewise the duty of the priests to offer incense twice daily on the altar of incense, and to trim and replenish with oil the golden candlestick. Special psalms with instrumental accompaniment were sung for each day of the week.

<sup>1</sup> By the "chief priests" mentioned in the NT are meant, besides the incumbent for the time being, the ex-high-priests whose period of office followed the abolition of the life-tenure under the Roman dominion. To belong to the small circle of families from which it had been customary to select the high-priests was in itself regarded as a high distinction (Ac 4<sup>6</sup>).

On sabbaths and festival days additional sacrifices were offered. Besides the public sacrifices, numerous private offerings testified to the ardour with which the Jewish people practised the observances of their ancestral faith. It is a curious fact that even Gentiles were permitted to offer complimentary sacrifices at Jerusalem, and to dedicate gifts to the Temple, although certainly it had long been customary for the Jews to offer prayers and sacrifices for their heathen rulers (Ezra 6<sup>10</sup>; Jer 29<sup>7</sup>). These mutual exchanges made a chink in the wall with which Judaism had fenced itself in from the outer world.

As regards the maintenance of the Temple ministry it may suffice here to note that by the regulations of the priestly code the emoluments of the clerical staff were greatly in excess of those customary in pre-exilic times. The practice adopted after the Exile appears to have been arrived at through a fusion of the prescriptions of Deuteronomy with those of the priestly code, and represented a material addition to the endowment of the clergy. Apart from the personal income of the priests, the expense of maintaining the Temple services was met by the tax of the half shekel, the annual provision of wood for the altar of burnt-offering, and voluntary gifts of money or treasure.

(2) *The Order of the Scribes and the Worship of the Synagogue*

The name scribe (*sopher*) acquired a new significance under Ezra, who is designated "the scribe" as well as "the priest" (Neh 8<sup>11</sup>). It is no longer denoted merely an amanuensis like Baruch (Jer 36<sup>26ff.</sup>), but a professional expert in the law (Torah), around which from this time centred the mental and religious activities of the Jewish people. The study and interpretation of it was regarded as the highest occupation open to any son of Israel, and in response to the demand for correct copies, particularly for use in the newly-formed syna-



gogues, quite naturally arose the office of the sopherim. Although their main location was at Jerusalem, this learned caste was represented in every part of Palestine. It was their peculiar task to study, expound, and guard the law, so that every Jew might learn its contents and meaning, and be saved from transgression before it was too late. Careful to observe harmony in their teaching, they soon organized themselves into a guild. In accordance with Ezra's plan the exposition and application of the law had formerly been in the hands of the priests (Hag 2<sup>11</sup> ; Mal 2<sup>5</sup>), but in view of the new importance attaching to it the full-time services of a body of specialists in this line became urgently requisite. The scribes thus served themselves heirs to the moral influence of the priesthood. Though they continued to be called scribes, these men were essentially lawyers, their whole concern was to practise and promote the study of the law. "The wisdom of the scribe," says the Son of Sirach, "cometh by opportunity of leisure, and he that hath little business shall become wise" (38<sup>24</sup>). Qualified scribes taught in their houses and in the synagogues, and in Jerusalem famous masters had class-rooms in the porches of the Temple. Advanced scholars were first admitted to the rank of Ḥabērīm (companions), and afterwards consecrated as rabbis. As a means of livelihood the rabbis mostly depended on their own handicraft, and were held in general reverence (Mt 23<sup>7</sup> ; Lk 20<sup>46</sup>). They were greeted in the streets as "rabbi," and in the case of eminent teachers as "rabban" (Mk 10<sup>61</sup> ; Jn 20<sup>16</sup>). The dignity ascribed to them in Eccles 10<sup>5</sup> was too apt, however, to degenerate into the conceited pomposity condemned by Jesus (Mt 23<sup>8ff.</sup>).

The idea underlying scribism was that it was the bounden duty of every Israelite to satisfy the requirements of the Torah down to the minutest detail. Not only so ; the scribes deliberately set themselves to *supplement* it, providing for omissions, clearing up

apparent discrepancies, and by deductions from its precepts aiming so to envisage the entire range of human conduct as to leave no possible situation in which the Jew should find himself without direction for the guidance of his conduct. The information thus imparted, however, was gained at a tremendous cost. It meant a vast increase in the sum-total of the obligations binding on the pious Jew, for to the precepts of the written law were thus added those of the no less binding oral traditional law known as the Halachah, or law of custom (Mt 15<sup>2</sup> ; Mk 7<sup>3</sup>). The labours of a multitude of teachers caused this to reach gigantic dimensions before it was ultimately embodied in the Talmud, c. A.D. 500. It was a high and noble project to which the scribes devoted their labours, but their efforts to preserve the Mosaic religion in its entirety by "making a fence" to it in the manner indicated,<sup>1</sup> and by rhetorically proclaiming it as pictured in the Book of Jubilees, were fatally counteracted by the unbearable yoke thus hung round the neck of the Jewish people (Ac 15<sup>10</sup>). Their fine-spun casuistry defeated itself because true religion does not consist in living according to an elaborate code of rules, but, as Jesus taught, in the inner life of the soul on which there has been breathed the breath of God (Lk 17<sup>21</sup> ; Jn 3<sup>5</sup>). God's Kingdom is not a Kingdom of scribal spiders spinning their interminable web, but an attitude towards life—that of sincere, loving, and obedient hearts.

One of the most notable features of post-exilic times was the institution of the synagogue.\* By the first century A.D. it was an appanage of all townships and hamlets of Palestine, a gathering-place for the devout on "every sabbath day" (Ac 15<sup>21</sup>). A sabbath morning service began with the recitation of the *Shema*.<sup>2</sup> This was

<sup>1</sup> For examples, see Hausrath, *op. cit.* i. 97 ff.

<sup>2</sup> This consisted of three selections from the Pentateuch (Dt 6<sup>4-9</sup>, 11<sup>13-21</sup> ; Num 15<sup>37-41</sup>), *Shema* being the initial word of the first of these passages.

practically a creed, expressing gratitude to Jahweh for the deliverance from Egypt, and was prefaced and concluded with a benediction. Then with the formula, " Bless ye Jahweh," the reader summoned the people to pray. This they did standing, with their faces turned toward Jerusalem. An approved liturgical prayer was offered by an adult worshipper, the congregation uttering certain responses, including the Amen. Thereupon followed readings from the law and the prophets (Ac 13<sup>15</sup>), with translation into the Aramaic vernacular. The lessons were read by priests and Levites, whom failing, by adult members present. Then followed a discourse based upon the passages read, and usually delivered by a scribe. As in the Temple ritual, the service was ended with a benediction. If no priest were present, it was pronounced by a layman in the form of a prayer. The main object of the service was that of instruction in the law—" to hear the law and to learn it accurately " (Jos. *c. Apion.* ii. 17). That this end was successfully attained may be inferred from the confident assertion of Josephus that while the Roman procurators were obliged to avail themselves of expert lawyers, " if any one should question us concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat all than his own name " (*c. Apion.* ii. 19). To this may be added the declaration of Philo : " Our houses of prayer in the several towns are none other than institutions for teaching prudence and bravery, temperance and justice, piety and holiness ; in short, every virtue which the human mind and the divine recognizes and enjoins " (*Vita Mosis*, iii. 27).

The synagogue was a church as well as a school. It was a house of prayer in which the worshipper learned that a real approach to God did not depend upon an elaborate priestly ritual, that prayer was a better sacrifice than the blood of bulls and goats, and that the sabbath devoted to the study of the Scriptures and hallowed by fellowship with brethren was more profitably spent when

thus stripped of its merely ceremonial character. Religiously as well as educationally the synagogue was an institution of supreme importance. In the weekly assemblies the people's hearts were stirred by earnest prayers, sacred songs, and edifying exhortations. Apart from the Temple ritual, their religious needs were satisfied, and there was no longer any reason for resisting the centralization at Jerusalem of the priestly worship. Through the synagogue not only was Judaism welded into a unity, and the acute cleavage between priests and laity broken down, but there was inaugurated a new conception of worship in accordance with which the Temple and its ritual were no longer essential. Inevitably the prestige of the Levitical caste began to decline, while that of the professional students and teachers of the law grew apace. Practically therefore the worship of the synagogue superseded that of the Temple, and became the focus and centre of religious life in Israel. Religion was no longer predominantly a matter of priests and sacrifices, but of personal thought and feeling; and thus under Jewish auspices was the way quietly prepared for the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth. The worship of the NT church is but that of the synagogue Christianized. "Christ was more associated with the synagogal type of worship than with that of the Temple," and the narrative in the Acts "shews the importance attached by the apostles to the synagogue and its services." <sup>1</sup>

### (3) *Jewish Parties*

(a) *The Pharisees and the Sadducees.*—The opposition between the Pharisaic and the Sadducean parties arose subsequent to Ezra's reformation, but became acutely developed only in the age of the Maccabees. The one party was closely associated with the scribes, the other

<sup>1</sup> Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 87 and p. 89.

with the priests. The fundamental characteristic of the Pharisees was their strict adherence to the letter of the Torah, and that of the Sadducees the retention of their prestige as a social aristocracy. It is from this standpoint rather than from any essential clash of doctrines or opinions that a correct estimate of the antagonism between the two parties can be formed. In reality it was a product of the historical conditions of the period, and grew simply out of the rival tendencies of the scribal and priestly ranks and the natural opposition between conservatism and reform.

As a distinctive title the name Pharisees (*Perūshim* = "separated") marked them off not only from the heathen (Ezra 6<sup>21</sup>), but also from the mass of the Jewish people (*Am-hāāretz*), whose notions of uncleanness were less stringent than their own (Jn 7<sup>49</sup>), and for His association with whom they were offended with Jesus. It was probably first applied to them by their opponents. They designated themselves *Habērīm* (brethren, neighbours, cf. Lk 10<sup>29</sup>), but readily fell in with the party name once it became current, for it quite fittingly expressed their claim to be the élite of the people and only true Israel. Not, however, that they were a "sect"<sup>1</sup>; on the contrary, they were the classical exponents of post-exilic Judaism.

The Pharisees were essentially a religious party. To politics as such they were indifferent; all they wanted was full liberty to obey the letter of the law. It was only because the royal power was being directed against the national religion that they joined in the rebellion of Mattathias. On the concession of religious freedom, they refused to aid the Hasmonaeans in their further fight for national independence. The same principle guided their action later on under Hyrcanus and Jannæus when the Hasmonæan priest-princes went over to the Sad-

<sup>1</sup> So Josephus, and AV in Ac 15<sup>5</sup>, 26<sup>5</sup>. The word (*αἵρεσις*) means simply a school.

ducees. Asked by Petronius whether they were prepared to fight against Cæsar, they replied : " We will not make war with him ; but still we will die rather than see our laws set aside " (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 8. 3). While resenting the domination of the heathen (Mt 22<sup>17</sup> and pls. ; Josephus, *Ant.* xv. ii. 4, *BJ* iv. 3. 9), they nevertheless viewed it as a divine punishment for their sins (*Jos. Ant.* xiv. 9. 4). To this attitude of abstention from worldly politics they consistently adhered, till by the time of Alexandra they obtained complete ascendancy over the minds of the people. As the trusted spiritual leaders of the national public life they were treated with the reverence which the Hindu pays to the Brahman.<sup>1</sup> Through their alliance with the scribes the influence of the synagogue now dwarfed the glory of the Temple. That they gave countenance latterly, however, to revolutionary measures is shewn by the fact that one of their number, a certain Saddukos, was the co-adjutor of Judas of Galilee in forming the party of the Zealots, who declared they would have no ruler but God (*Jos. Ant.* xviii. i. 1). The Jewish historian speaks of them as a " cunning sect " who were " in a great capacity of opposing kings " (*Ant.* xvii. 2. 4).

The Pharisees were virtually the Ḥasīdīm (" the pious ") of a somewhat earlier epoch. Their aim was to put into actual practice the ideal scheme of life drawn up by the scribes. This was what they lived for ; in their judgment it was *the* one thing worth doing. Strict in their observance of the law, they were also constant in their defence of it. From the frequent conjunction of " scribes and Pharisees " in the NT it is obvious that on the definite formation of the party the bulk, though not all (Mk 2<sup>16</sup> ; Ac 23<sup>9</sup>), of the scribes joined its ranks. Thus reinforced, Pharisaism became the dominant factor in the further development of the Jewish law until it found final literary expression in the Talmud and

<sup>1</sup> Hausrath, *op. cit.* i. p. 150.

the Mishnah. In the hands of the scribes that development gradually took shape as the Halachah or tradition of the elders, and this oral law was boldly declared to be equally binding with the written law, nay, even more so. In his able and chivalrous defence of Pharisaism, R. T. Herford characterizes this evolution of tradition as "a sign of the continued vitality of Torah, not the strangling of it," but in face of the verdict of Jesus (Mt 15<sup>a</sup>), can this view be entertained? There is no reason to doubt that originally the formalism of the Pharisees was based upon a heartfelt desire to obey the divine behests; but as time went on and legalism was laboriously developed, it inevitably degenerated into gross externalism (Mt 23<sup>25</sup>), odious self-righteousness (Lk 18<sup>9ff.</sup>), and quibbling casuistry (Mk 7<sup>11</sup>). What Jesus denounced was not their careful observance of the law, but their hollow insincerity (Mt 23<sup>23ff.</sup>). Although this condemnation was levelled against the party as a whole, it is not, of course, to be inferred that every member of it was devoid of a truly religious spirit. Such an idea is sufficiently refuted by pointing to the names of Hillel and Gamaliel—illustrious teachers who doubtless had many like-minded disciples.

Describing himself as having been "a Pharisee" (Ph 3<sup>5</sup>), Paul has enumerated what as such he considered his principal assets. He took pride in his circumcision, in his Hebrew descent, and in the distinguished position in Judaism which was his personally. As a champion of the law he had been "blameless" in respect of its outward observances, and at the same time a zealous persecutor of the Church (Gal 1<sup>13</sup>); viewing the Christian religion as derogatory to the religion of the law, he had set himself to destroy it. His error had been in trusting to these "gains" for his salvation. And no one ever saw this more clearly than the apostle himself after his conversion. He who had so prided himself on his circumcision then began openly to declare that "he

is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh ; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly ; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God " (Ro 2<sup>28f.</sup>). He who had set so much store by his Israelitish descent now taught that " they are not all Israel, who are of Israel " (Ro 9<sup>6</sup>). He who had valued so highly his distinction in respect of the law now made it a cardinal point in his doctrine that " by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in God's sight : for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets ; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe " (Ro 3<sup>20ff.</sup>). In short, he had reversed his attitude toward the Lord Jesus Christ, and come to see that salvation is not the fruit of a good moral life *plus* the careful performance of outward religious ceremonies, but of trust in " Jesus Christ and Him crucified " (1 Co 2<sup>2</sup>). All his ideas of things were reversed. He found all he wanted for time and for eternity in Christ, and in this way whatsoever things were " gain " to him, he had learned to reckon as loss (Ph 3<sup>7</sup>). From having been a Pharisee he had become a Christian ; and in his case there was an end to that weary toil of attempting to carry out every precept of the ever-expanding ceremonial law, for " being justified by faith " he had found " peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ " (Ro 5<sup>1</sup>).

The Sadducees, whose name is most probably derived from Zadok the priest (Ezek 40<sup>46</sup>, etc. ; 2 Chron 31<sup>10</sup>), were mainly the party, not of the priests as such, but of the priestly aristocracy, *i.e.* the high-priestly families. According to Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 10. 6), their adherents were drawn only from those who filled important offices (cf. Ac 4<sup>1</sup>), or whose wealth gave them high



social standing. While accepting the written law, they repudiated the binding obligation of the Pharisaic tradition of the elders as developed by the labours of the scribes. Not that they necessarily disagreed in every particular with that tradition; they merely refused to regard it as authoritative. So far from bowing to authority as the Pharisees did, they considered it meritorious to dispute with their teachers (*Jos. Ant.* xviii. 1. 4).

The Sadducean creed is briefly summed up in *Ac* 23<sup>8</sup>: "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." Adopting an eschatological standpoint which was purely negative, they knew nothing of the hope which is "full of immortality" (*Wisd* 3<sup>4</sup>). Seeing that in their view there is no survival of the individual soul after death, they naturally entertained neither the idea of a bodily resurrection nor that of future retribution. Their materialistic outlook led them also to deny the existence of angels and spirits. In both of these particulars they did not deviate substantially from the OT pre-exilic point of view. A further article of the Sadducean creed was that men carve out their own destiny, and that God has nothing to do with it. A man can choose good or evil as he prefers, and there is no such thing as divine predestination or co-operation in the working out of any human lot.

In point of doctrinal divergency between Pharisees and Sadducees too much importance need not be attached to the grandiose language of Josephus, who writes as if they were rival philosophical sects (*BJ* ii. 8. 2; *Ant.* xviii. 1. 3, 4). All that his Hellenistically coloured statements really amount to is that the Pharisees held by the orthodox Jewish belief with respect to resurrection and retribution (*Dn* 12<sup>2</sup>), the existence of angels and spirits (*Ac* 12<sup>15</sup>), and apparently, though the report under this head is somewhat questionable, the co-

operation of divine providence with human freedom and accountability, whereas the Sadducees on the contrary contended that soul and body perished together, that there is no resurrection, neither angels nor spirits, and that man is entirely the architect of his own lot. Behind the jealousy between these two parties as men of the schools and men of office there lay the deeper opposition of their views of life. Although nominally the actual power lay with the Sadducæan aristocracy, theirs was but a minority rule. Accustomed to handle political affairs under the Persian and Greek supremacy, the priestly nobility allowed the religious side of their official duties to sink into the background. They had, in fact, become Hellenists and devotees of Greek art, culture, and manners, if not quite so scandalously as Jason and Menelaus in the crisis brought on by the Syrian oppression. Cowed for a time by the success of the Maccabæan revolt, they still retained a sympathetic outlook on Hellenistic life and customs. Adhering as they did to the older point of view in doctrine and ritual, the Sadducees were also more lenient than the Pharisees with regard to the enforcement of penal enactments (Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9. 1, xiii. 10. 6), and lent no countenance to the art of toning them down by skilful interpretation. As religionists the Sadducees lacked the zeal of their Pharisaic opponents, contented themselves with a minimum of religious observances, and were pure worldlings at heart. In the Roman period they retained office under humiliating conditions, and while for the Pharisees the destruction of the Temple only brought increased strength and influence, for the Sadducees it meant utter extinction.

(b) *The Essenes and the Zealots.*—Although reckoned by Josephus a third Jewish "sect," the Essenes were simply a kind of monastic order or mystery-club associated in a special community of worship, represented indeed in the towns and villages of Palestine, but mostly

located in the valley of Engedi, bordering on the Dead Sea. There, remote from all "questionable handicrafts," they led mainly an agricultural life, enriched by prayer, lustrations, and common meals. No mention of them is found in Scripture, though some interpreters of the Pauline Epistles have inferred their presence in Colossæ and in Rome. As a religious order they seem to have originated in the second century B.C., and are unknown to history after the second century A.D. Philo and Josephus computed their number at fully four thousand. The name is of uncertain origin, but with most probability is traced to an Aramaic word signifying "pious." The Essenes were in no sense a political party, but essentially a religious brotherhood organized upon strictly ascetic lines, and bound by solemn oaths to keep their tenets secret from outsiders. Admission to the order was signalized by the symbolic gifts of a pickaxe, a girdle, and a white garment. Then followed a double novitiate of three years, after which leave was given to share in the religious observance of the common meals which, as sacrificial feasts, were prepared by priestly hands and consecrated by priestly prayers. Anticipating the practice of the early Christians, they had all things common, "stewards" being appointed to receive the revenues from farming or handicraft to defray expenses to minister to the sick, or to dispense charity.

The main object of the Essenes was the avoidance of defilement and the attainment of purity. In this respect they were as much keener than the Pharisees as the Pharisees were keener than the populace in general. Their retirement from public life was due to their desire to separate themselves from everything unclean. Only in settlements of their own, "far from the madding crowd," could their religious convictions be effectually carried out. Like the Indian Banians of to-day, they had to go and wash if touched by one not belonging to their own order. All sensual desires they condemned as

sinful, and all worldly concerns they viewed as alien to their ideals and interests. They forbade marriage, swearing of oaths, and anointing with oil.<sup>1</sup> Slavery and war were banned, and likewise trade as leading to avarice. Bodily excretions were disposed of according to the law of Dt 23<sup>12f.</sup> The daily routine of the brotherhood began shortly before sunrise with songs of praise followed by prayers and washings. At the fifth hour (11 a.m.) the scattered labourers gathered together for a collective plunge into cold water. In consecrated robes they then partook of the common meal, which was limited to bread and one vegetable. Thereafter, divesting themselves of the festal robe, they resumed their toil. An evening meal and divine worship concluded the programme for the day. Conspicuous for simplicity and abstinence, the Essenes were held in great reverence by the multitude, with whom, however, they mingled as little as possible. Josephus and Philo both testify that they excelled in virtue, their course of life being "better than that of other men."<sup>2</sup>

In their doctrinal tenets the Essenes were Pharisees in the superlative. They were monotheists and firm believers in Providence, greatly revered the law, and were most rigid sabbatarians. Excluded from the Temple at Jerusalem because, deeming their own sacrificial feasts to be of superior worth, they offered no animal sacrifices, they nevertheless sent gifts of incense to the sacred shrine. They rejected the Pharisaic

<sup>1</sup> Apart, that is, from the stern oath sworn on admission to the order. Their objection to the use of ointment may have been due not so much to their asceticism as to their repudiation of the OT priesthood which was consecrated by unction. So Bousset.

<sup>2</sup> The particulars here set down regarding the Essenes are taken chiefly from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 1. 5, based perhaps on Philo; *BJ* ii. 8. 2-12). In spite of his Græcising of them as a "philosophical sect," there is no reason to doubt that his statement of facts is substantially correct. Philo endeavours to make them approximate to his own philosophy and method, and represents them as sharing his own delight in the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

doctrine of a bodily resurrection, but taught the immortality of the soul. In their conception souls emerged from the purest ether, and were imprisoned in bodies on account of a sinful relapse into sensual pleasures. Their world-view was dualistic; all material existence they regarded as inherently evil. The soul of man was considered extraneous to a world of sense, in which falsehood, greed, and lust prevail; it could enter upon a blessed immortality only after casting off these stains and leaving the prison-house behind. They held that salvation could not be attained in a world of sense, and that the wicked were doomed to suffer eternal torment. Specially concerned to unravel the secrets of the future, they ransacked "the writings of the ancients,"<sup>1</sup> intent on discovering what is most advantageous to soul and body, and on finding out the healing properties of roots and stones. As diligent students of the prophetic books they paid special attention to angelology<sup>2</sup> and eschatology, and were in high repute as foretellers of the future.<sup>3</sup> Their invocation of the sun as the image of the divine light is a further and arresting peculiarity.

While Essenism has much in common with Pharisaic legalism, which it represents in a more intense degree, it was also characterized by certain features quite alien to Judaism, in particular its dualistic psychology, its rejection of animal sacrifices, and its invocation of the sun. Such deviations from the Jewish standpoint clearly reflect the impact of foreign influences. To what quarter these are to be ascribed, however, remains a vexed question. That Essenism was fundamentally and

<sup>1</sup> It is uncertain whether the reference here (*Jos. BJ* ii. 8. 6) is to the OT or to special books of their own.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Paul's prohibition of angel-worship in *Col* 2<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Judas the Essene predicted the murder of Antigonus, brother of Aristobulus (*Jos. BJ* i. 3. 5; *Ant.* xiii. 11. 2); Menahem foretold Herod's future rule, and partly also its duration (*Ant.* xv. 10. 5); Simon prophesied the downfall of Archelaus, Herod's son (*Ant.* xvii. 13. 3; *BJ* ii. 7. 3).

chiefly a product of Judaism is beyond dispute, but caution must be shown in forming a judgement concerning the sources of its non-Jewish features. Most probably, however, they were either Greek or Persian, or a mixture of both. In any case the fact remains that the Essenes were the only section of the Hebrew race who actually broke away from the Jewish church.

By Josephus the Zealots were ranked as "the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy." They were, in fact, a fanatical and revolutionary war-party (cf. Mt 11<sup>12</sup>)—"the Jingoos among the Jews." The circumstances relating to their origin and exploits have been already stated (p. 50 f.). Basing their movement upon the dying charge of Mattathias to his sons: "Be ye zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers" (1 Macc 2<sup>50</sup>; 2 Macc 4<sup>2</sup>), and hence called Zealots, they took the field under the leadership of "Judas of Galilee." With the watchword: "No Lord but Jahweh; no tax but that to the Temple; no friend but the zealot," they rallied many, especially of the youth, to their banner. Later on, goaded by the cruelties of Gessius Florus (A.D. 64-66), they allied themselves to the Sicarii, the wildest revolutionaries of all, who set about exterminating their political adversaries by assassination. Religious agitators of the type referred to in Ac 21<sup>38</sup> made common cause with the war-intoxicated faction in inciting the Jews to revolt, "till all Judæa was filled with their madness" (Jos. *BJ* ii. 13. 6; *Ant.* xx. 5. 5). In the final stage of the movement (as recorded above, p. 66 ff.) the Zealots were led by John of Giscala, who in A.D. 67 got the upper hand in Jerusalem and initiated a reign of terror. His tyrannical rule was challenged by Simon ben-Giora, while a new party also was formed under Eleasar, son of Simon. Civil war ensued, and Jerusalem was given over to internal feuds which precipitated the downfall of the Jewish State, and with it the extinction of

the Zealots in the ruins of Masâda. There perished some nine hundred refugees along with Eleasar, the grandson of Judas, who set fire to the fortress in order that the Romans might be balked of their prey.

It is significant that Paul in his Epistle to the Romans still had occasion to contend against the ideas of the Galilean revolutionaries as surviving even among professing Christians, warning against "a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge" (10<sup>2</sup>), inculcating the practice of kindness instead of vengeance towards enemies (12<sup>19f.</sup>), and of due submission to constituted civil authority (13<sup>1ff.</sup>).

#### (4) *The Jews a People of the Law*

Underlying the consuming zeal for the law in post-exilic Judaism was the firm belief in rewards and punishments. A purely legal conception of the covenant between Jahweh and Israel was prevalent ; it was viewed strictly as a bargain in terms of which obedience on the part of the nation or individual was pledged in return for a corresponding divine reward, while every sin of omission or of commission involved a corresponding punishment. The inevitable result of this identifying religion and morality was the reduction of the spiritual life to a mechanical externalism, and the extinction of that inner spontaneity which lies at the root of ethical practice. No question of motive could enter into such a scheme of life ; it had regard to one thing only—the fulfilling of the law to the last jot or tittle. That was the recurring decimal of Jewish thought and practice. Things were put upon a dead level, and the highest duties of religion and ethics were of no greater importance than the trifling minutiae of outward ceremonies. To satisfy the letter of the law was from this point of view the whole duty of man. By the hair-splitting labour of the scribes, and their genius for making distinctions, every command was microscopically analysed, and overloaded with an

ever-increasing multitude of inferential details in order to provide a kind of moral ready-reckoner for every possible contingency in actual life. Under this system no scope was left for unfettered moral action ; it was stamped out by a crushing load of legal exactions. To attend to the precepts of the ceremonial law was for the children of the covenant the one thing needful, and they pursued it with a misplaced zeal (Ro 10<sup>2</sup>) till it became an intolerable burden (Ac 15<sup>10</sup>).<sup>1</sup>

Some idea of the extraordinary development of the law with respect to the observance of the sabbath can be gathered from the NT writings (Mt 12<sup>1f.</sup> ; Mk 2<sup>23f.</sup> ; Lk 6<sup>1f.</sup>), but for a full comprehension of the treatment given to this and other statutory enactments recourse must be had to the rabbinical subtleties piled up in the Mishnah. To quote a single instance, that containing the prohibition against making or untying a knot on the sabbath (Nos. 21 and 22 of the thirty-nine kinds of work forbidden) : " The following are the knots, the making of which renders a man guilty : the knot of camel-drivers and that of sailors ; and as one is guilty by reason of tying, so also of untying them. R. Meir says : Guilt is not incurred by reason of a knot which can be untied with one hand. There are knots by reason of which one is not guilty, as one is in the case of the camel-drivers' and sailors' knots. A woman may tie up a slit in her shift and the strings of her cap, the straps of the shoes and sandals, of skins of wine and oil, of a pot with meat." <sup>2</sup> And to tie the strings of a girdle being permitted, it was agreed that a pail also might be tied over the well with a girdle, but not with a rope.

A considerable section (twelve treatises) of the Mishnah is devoted to the regulations concerning cleanliness and uncleanness outlined in the Pentateuch (Lev

<sup>1</sup> For specific examples, see Schürer, II. ii. p. 96 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, II. ii. p. 98, quoting from *Shabbath*, xv. 1-2.



11<sup>15</sup>; Num 5<sup>1-4</sup>, 19, 31<sup>20-24</sup>). The different kinds of uncleanness, the circumstances under which each is contracted, how and to what extent it is transmitted to others, what utensils and objects can and what cannot become unclean, and the means of purification applicable to the nature and degree of uncleanness—all are discussed in tedious and bewildering detail.<sup>1</sup>

As in the case of the Romans in performing their religious rites, the stress laid upon formal correctness of outward action tended to dry up the springs of genuine piety. Wearing fringes according to the injunction in Num 15<sup>38</sup>; Dt 22<sup>12</sup>, the fastening of the Mesusah to house and room doors, amulets ("phylacteries") for the arm and the forehead containing small parchment rolls in which were written passages from Exodus and Deuteronomy, and fasting (Lk 18<sup>12</sup>), formed the main visible insignia of ostensibly superior piety in the time of Christ. The spectacle presented to the eye was that of religion in livery—a poor parody of what is essentially a matter of the heart. Devotion was further externalized by being made a theme for casuistic debate. Men were concerned not about the content of the Shema<sup>2</sup> itself, but about the exact time when it should be begun and ended, about the validity of it should one be reading the Scriptures at the morning or evening hour for saying it. They wished to know whether during the repetition of it and under what conditions salutations were permissible, whether it was duly performed if inaudible to the ear, and whether when a mistake was made in the recital it was necessary to begin again at the point where it occurred. Under such thralldom to a legalistic performance of a mechanical formula, prayer could scarcely be the "vital breath" of men truly and humbly

<sup>1</sup> On ordinances relating to cleanness and uncleanness and the ritual of purification, see Schürer, II. ii. p. 107 ff., and the Bible Dictionaries.

approaching the mercy-seat. Rather did it tend to hypocrisy (Mt 6<sup>5</sup> ; Mk 7<sup>6</sup>, 12<sup>40</sup> ; Lk 20<sup>47</sup>).

Enough has been said to indicate that the real requirements of religion and morality were overlooked when the point of cardinal importance was taken to be the literal fulfilment of the law rather than the inward realization of its spiritual meaning and purpose. "Oh, how great is the difference," says Archbishop Trench, "between submitting oneself to a complex of rules and casting oneself on a beating Heart!"

### (5) *The Messianic Hope*

For the Greeks and Romans the Golden Age lay in the past ; for the Jews it was still to come. In the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era there had grown up a widespread feeling that neither collectively nor individually had their observance of the law brought them in adequate measure its expected reward, and the disappointment thus engendered led to a correspondingly eager hope of better things in the time that lay ahead. This hope now became the centre of religious aspiration in Israel.

(a) *Development of the Older Messianic Idea.*—This hope, which had already found expression in the oracles of the OT prophets, had sometimes become dim, but only to undergo periodic revival. After the Maccabaeian revolt, for example, it acquired special intensity (cf. Ps 110 ; 2 Macc 2<sup>18</sup>). And if it thus fluctuated from time to time in vitality, it also assumed a variety of aspects, in this respect presenting a marked contrast to the unchanging requirements of the law. While the older Messianic hope contemplated only the happy estate of a spiritually renovated and materially prosperous Israelitish nation, the scope of Messianic expectation was now enlarged so as to embrace the whole world, with Jahweh as King over all (Zec 14<sup>9</sup>). "That," says De Wette,

" was the noblest part of the Messianic hopes, and has been fulfilled in Christianity." It likewise became a hope for the individual as well as for the nation and the world. The godly had the conviction that if they died before the glorious manifestation of the Kingdom they would be raised again to share in the great inheritance (Dn 12<sup>21</sup>). Further, the Messianic expectation was viewed as destined to be realized in a purely transcendental manner. The present state of things, it was thought, would be suddenly and miraculously brought to an end, and the blessings of the future æon, including the new Jerusalem, would descend out of heaven from God, an idea which recurs in the Johannine Apocalypse (21<sup>2</sup>. 10). These developments and modifications did not, however, universally prevail, and in many minds the older hope of a dazzling future for the nation, and the restored glory of the house of David, retained predominance. In the time of Christ it existed both in its more indeterminate form and in its special aspect as the hope of a personal Messiah (Mt 11<sup>3</sup>; Lk 7<sup>19-29</sup>; Ac 1<sup>6</sup>).

(b) *To what extent is this Historical Development reflected in the Jewish Literature of the Period?*—The Book of Daniel, dating from the time of the Maccabæan rising, and written for the consolation of Israel under the persecution of Antiochus iv. Epiphanes, first sounds the note of deliverance. God will destroy the kingdoms of this world, and set up an everlasting kingdom to be possessed by His saints (7<sup>26f.</sup>). The righteous dead will be raised to participate in its endless life (12<sup>2</sup>). Nothing is said by the writer about a personal Messianic King reigning over this kingdom, the expression " like unto a son of man " (7<sup>13</sup>) being applicable only to " the people of the saints of the Most High " (7<sup>27</sup>). Just as the world-kingdoms are presented under the guise of beasts coming up out of the sea, so is the kingdom of the saints represented by one in the form of a man from heaven. In Daniel the former Messianic hope is

thus supplemented in two important particulars: there is proclaimed (1) the universal sovereignty of the saints, (2) the resurrection of departed saints to share in the glories of the kingdom.

In the OT Apocrypha the standpoint is practically that of the older prophets. Certain passages have been singled out as being of Messianic significance. In these, frequent allusion is made to a period of future glory and blessedness for Israel, but without any reference to a personal Messiah. The everlasting throne of David's house is a mere historical reminiscence (Ecclus 47<sup>11</sup>; 1 Macc 2<sup>57</sup>). So long as the Maccabæan sovereignty promised a measure of independence under the law, Palestinian Jews were ready to acquiesce, but in Alexandria, where Jews were still under the Gentile yoke, the oldest Sibyllines proclaim the approach of the righteous King. The central point is not the reign of the deliverer, but the subjection of all nations to the land and the Temple.

In the Book of Enoch <sup>1</sup> the Messiah-hope is reflected in the second part of the Vision of Judgement (83-90), containing a survey of the world's history down to the setting up of the Messianic Kingdom, and ascribed by Charles to B.C. 166-161.<sup>2</sup> Through the instrumentality of "the great horn," *i.e.* Judas Maccabæus, divine judgement will be executed upon the faithless "watchers," *i.e.* the seventy shepherds or fallen angels, and upon the apostate Jews. A new Jerusalem, miraculously brought from heaven, will take the place of the old (90<sup>28f.</sup>). Remanent Gentiles will be converted and serve Israel

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.*, 1 Enoch—in these pages frequently called simply Enoch.

<sup>2</sup> Bousset assigns it to the time of Alexandra (B.C. 78-69). (The question of date depends chiefly upon the view taken of "the great horn" of 90<sup>9</sup>). If the allusion is to Judas Maccabæus, this section of Enoch must have been written before his death in B.C. 161, since he is still campaigning at the close of the rule of the shepherds (90<sup>18</sup>), but if John Hyrcanus is meant, it would (with Dillmann and Schürer) have to be assigned to a considerably later date.

(90<sup>30</sup>). Dispersed Jews will be gathered together, and the righteous dead will rise to share in the kingdom (90<sup>33</sup>). Finally, a white bull, *i.e.* the Messiah, will appear (90<sup>37</sup>); all the members of the kingdom will take on his likeness, and God will rejoice over them.

In the oldest Jewish Sibyllines (*c.* B.C. 140) the Messianic strain of iii. 652-794 is unmistakable. It is here declared that God will send from the East a King who at His command will cause war to cease from the whole earth. Hostile pagans will be destroyed, and the people of the Immortal will live under His protection. Then will the heathen nations be attracted to His service, and an everlasting kingdom be established over all mankind, with Jerusalem as its capital, and with the prophets as governors. The Messiah is not expressly named, but in view of the spiritualistic trend of Alexandrian Judaism it is certainly significant that the writer should set the Messianic King in the foreground of his picture.

The Book of Jubilees, written probably in the time of Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-105) portrays in glowing colours the gladsome days in store for a penitent Israel; wickedness will be uprooted, and men will live to the age of a thousand years. But unless we are to find it in the statement of 31<sup>18</sup> regarding the coming of a "prince" sprung from Judah, there is no specific mention of a personal Messiah. Perhaps the writer had in view a temporary Messianic kingdom already in being, namely, the high-priestly dynasty of the Hasmonaeans, established by popular decree in B.C. 141 as an expression of the nation's gratitude to "Simon and his sons" (1 Macc 14<sup>25, 41</sup>; cf. Ps 110<sup>1, 4</sup>). In any case he expects a gradual realization of the kingdom through the conjunct transformation of nature and man.

The figure of the Messianic King is more clearly delineated in the Psalter of Solomon (B.C. 63-48). Emphasis is laid by the writer both upon the divine

sovereignty (17<sup>1</sup>) and upon the permanence of David's house (17<sup>4</sup>). Roman rule and the Sadducæan sympathies of the Hasmonæan princes combine to make him eagerly long for a triumphant Davidic king to free the Holy Land from pagan defilement (17<sup>23-27</sup>). Blessed will they be who live under his spirit-taught rule (17<sup>42-45</sup>). Although the conception of the anointed king is strongly idealistic, he is at the same time realistically depicted as a veritable earthly potentate.

The same association of a personal Messiah with the conception of the Kingdom of God characterizes iii. 46-92 of the Sibylline oracles, a product of the time of Antony and Cleopatra. In the view of the author the establishment of the Kingdom of God and the advent of a sanctified world-ruler will coincide with the conquest of Egypt by the Romans (iii. 46-50). As in the Psalms of Solomon, the idea of God Himself as the eternal King is bound up with the dominion of the Messiah as the holy King (iii. 49).

In the section of the Book of Enoch known as the Parables or Similitudes, and composed according to Charles between B.C. 94 and 79, the Messianic doctrine is strikingly prominent. For the first time the Messiah is distinctly represented as the supernatural Son of Man, pre-existent from all eternity (48<sup>3</sup>)—a remarkable combination of the Messianic idea with the speculative doctrine of Alexandrian Judaism. Filled with the spirit of wisdom and prophecy (49<sup>1-3</sup>), and a staff to the righteous (48<sup>4</sup>), the Messiah is further represented as a judge sitting on the throne of his glory (45<sup>3</sup>), which is also God's throne (51<sup>3</sup>), as destroying the ungodly with the breath of his mouth (62<sup>2</sup>), and as ruling over all (62<sup>6</sup>). After the judgement on men and angels (61<sup>8</sup>) the Messianic kingdom will be inaugurated. Heaven and earth will be transformed (45<sup>4</sup>) and become "the dwelling-places of the holy" (39<sup>4</sup>) in the company of his righteous angels (39<sup>5</sup>) to all eternity (62<sup>14</sup>). As in

later Judaism generally, there is no thought of a *suffering* Messiah.

From the Assumption of Moses, an apocalyptic work dating from A.D. 7-30, the expectation of an earthly Messiah is altogether absent. The writer gives eloquent expression to the religious aspect of the Messianic idea (chap. x.), but without any specific mention of the Messianic King. Schürer suggests that this may be due to his having belonged to the party of the Zealots, so that his ideal would not be a monarchic one. Be this as it may, he does not go beyond the expression of an eager expectation that the eternal God will come forth for the chastisement of the heathen and the exaltation of Israel.

Proof of the prevalence in Egypt of the Messianic idea is afforded by the fact that in his estimate of the happiness reserved for the righteous, Philo utilizes the image of the Messianic King. This writer forecasts the simultaneous return to the Holy Land of all the enslaved who shew allegiance to the law. Guided by a divine appearance invisible to all but themselves, they will re-occupy and restore the deserted land. These statements in *De execr.* 8-9 are supplemented by the account given in *De præm. et pœnis* (15-20) of the signal blessings which will attend the advent of the new era. Wild beasts will become tame according to the prophecy (Num 24<sup>7</sup>, LXX): "A man shall go forth to battle and subdue many nations"; strength of body and mind (17-18), wealth and prosperity (21) will be the portion of the saints. Who is the divine-human form who wars victoriously over powerful nations? Philo does not expressly call him the Messiah, and admittedly it was more congenial to him to lay stress as he does on the liberating power of virtue, of a pure heart and a trustful hope. Yet he seems to have had the Logos in view. His description of the return to Palestine is reminiscent of the desert journey under the guidance of the pillars of cloud and

fire, for in these pillars also, as Dähne points out, Philo found the Logos allegorically, and in another passage (*Quis rer. div. hæc.*, 508 ff. ; cf. *Wisd* 10<sup>17</sup>) describes him as a vicegerent of the Most High, and as an angel invisible to human eyes.<sup>1</sup>

Josephus (A.D. 37-c. 100) deliberately refrains from taking account of the Messianic expectation. Thus in referring to the fulfilment of certain of Balaam's predictions he ignores the Messianic prophecy of Num 24<sup>10ff.</sup> simply remarking that "one may easily guess that the rest will have their completion in due time" (*Ant.* iv. 6. 5). Similarly, with regard to Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadrezzar's dream, he excuses himself from giving any opinion as to the significance of "the stone . . . cut out of the mountain" (*Dn* 2<sup>45</sup>), on the plea that as a historian it is not for him to deal with the future (*Ant.* x. 10. 4). The passage in which Jesus is spoken of as "the Christ" (*Ant.* xviii. 3. 3) is probably spurious. That in any case he did not personally share the Messianic hope is evident from his assertion during the siege of Jerusalem that God had now given the dominion to Italy (*BJ* v. 93), and from his subsequent attachment to the imperial family under the cognomen of Flavius.

The Apocalypse of Baruch, probably a composite work, written according to Charles between 50 and 90 A.D. and relating his experiences before and after the fall of Jerusalem, conceives the period of tribulation as comprising twelve parts, each with its own distinctive visitation (27<sup>1-15</sup>). The Messiah will then be revealed, and will destroy the enemies of Israel and inaugurate the reign of peace. At the end of the present world he will return in glory to heaven. Then the dead will be raised and judgement pronounced. In the sixth section Baruch has a vision of a cedar and a vine, which symbolize the Roman Empire and the triumphant Messiah. Still



another vision (53-74) is vouchsafed to Baruch—that of the issue from a cloud of twelve discharges of waters, black and white alternately, symbolizing six evil and six good periods in the history of the world. The clear waters adumbrated the bliss of the Messianic era, which should mark the end of the corruptible and “the beginning of that which is incorruptible.”

While exhibiting close affinity with the general eschatological standpoint of Baruch, 2 (4) Ezra limits the reign of the Messiah to four hundred years. He and all men who breathe will then die (7<sup>29</sup>). For seven days the world will be sunk in the silence of death, but after this the dead will rise again, and the Most High will appear upon the judgement-seat (7<sup>31f.</sup>). This book presents no clear-cut conception of the Messiah as either “very God” or very man. He is distinguished from Jahweh Himself, and by reason of his dying is not essentially divine. On the other hand, he is no ordinary man, but comes up out of the sea in the likeness of a man (13<sup>5. 25</sup>) through whom the Most High, having reserved him for long, shall at the appointed time deliver His creation (13<sup>26</sup>). On his advent as “the lion,” “the anointed one” (12<sup>31f.</sup>), the Roman dominion will become his prey (12<sup>33</sup>); the new Jerusalem will appear (7<sup>26</sup>); and the ten tribes will return to their own land (13<sup>39f.</sup>).

That these Messianic hopes, though varying somewhat in form and degree, had become a truly national possession may be deduced from their enshrinement in the Shemoneh Esreh as finally shaped about the end of the first Christian century. In this, the thrice-repeated daily prayer obligatory for every Jew, supplication is made for the gathering of the outcasts of Israel, the restoration of civic institution as aforetime, the speedy establishment of the Davidic kingdom, and the restoration of the sacrificial service. Amid whatever fluctuations by which the Messianic hope was characterized

during the post-exilic period, and in spite of the scholastic form given to it by the scribes, the Gospels clearly attest its general prevalence at the time of Christ, and that, too, as the definite hope of a transcendent personal Messianic King. In Palestine, however, the sense of contentment induced by the Maccabaeian triumphs had rather dimmed the ardour of Messianic expectation. In their yearning for a temporal kingdom the Jews in the home land failed to give due regard to the religious aspect of the Messiah. Theirs was mainly a political hope, and for a time they pinned their faith to the Hasmonaeian dynasty. Disillusionment came to them, however, in the course of the conflict between a priestly hierarchy and the party of the law. Inspired at length by the old prophetic message (Is 9<sup>8f.</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>) they attached themselves to the Pharisees, renounced the idea of an earthly ruler altogether, and waited for the "Wonderful" king who would reign as "the Prince of Peace." That in Egypt the Messiah-hope still continued in undiminished strength is clear from the fact already mentioned, namely, that, contrary to all the prepossessions of Hellenistic Judaism, the figure of the Messianic King is so prominently introduced not only in the Jewish Sibyllines, but also by Philo in the character of a victorious warrior for God.

(c) *Doctrinal Content of the Messianic Hope.*—Two preliminary observations are pertinent here, the one relating to the dark background, and the other to the heralds of the Messianic hope.

In the literature of the period the expectation of a brighter future shines through dark clouds of tribulation. These gather in volume and intensity on the approach of the Deliverer, which is heralded by marvellous omens in the sky, extraordinary convulsions of nature, unnatural strife among men, and by earthquakes and famine (2 (4) Ezra 9<sup>3</sup>). Warriors are seen in the clouds and swords in the heavens (Sib. iii. 796-807 ; cf. 2 Macc 5<sup>2f.</sup> ;

Jos. *BJ* vi. 5. 3); the sun will shine by night and the moon by day, and blood ooze out of wood (4 Ezra 5); those bound by the closest ties will turn their weapons against each other (6<sup>24</sup>, 13<sup>31</sup>); and fever and famine will claim their victims (16<sup>22</sup>; Jub 23<sup>13</sup>).

Concerning the forerunners of the Messiah, the idea that Elijah would return to restore the whole theocratic order of things, and so prepare His way, was based on Mal 4<sup>5f.</sup>.<sup>1</sup> It is found in Sir 48<sup>10</sup>, and repeatedly in our canonical Gospels (Mt 17<sup>10</sup> and pls.). Jesus, however, pointed out that the Elias in question is not the prophet, but John the Baptist (Mt 17<sup>12</sup>, 11<sup>14</sup>), in whom the restoration has been in the highest sense realized.<sup>2</sup> The prophets like unto Moses (Dt 18<sup>15</sup>), Jeremiah (Mt 16<sup>14</sup>), and either Enoch or Moses (Rev 11<sup>3</sup>), were also regarded as returning forerunners of the Messiah.

(a) Of central importance here is the actual advent of the Messiah. The names given to him in addition to that of the Messiah or "the anointed" (En. 48<sup>10</sup>, 52<sup>4</sup>), are those of "Christ the Lord" (Ps of Sol 17<sup>36</sup>, 18<sup>6.8</sup>), "the Elect One" (En 40<sup>5</sup>, 45<sup>3f.</sup>, etc.), "the Righteous One" (38<sup>2</sup>), "the Son of God" (105<sup>2</sup>; 4 Ezra 7<sup>28f.</sup>, etc.). The appellation "Son of Man," suggested by Daniel's image (Dn 7<sup>13</sup>) is in En. 46<sup>1-4</sup>, etc., definitely transferred to the Messiah. That he would arise from the seed of David according to the prophecies of the OT (Is 11<sup>1</sup>; Jer 23<sup>5</sup>; Am 9<sup>11</sup>, etc.) was an accepted belief; hence the NT usage: "Son of David."

It is not easy to pronounce upon the view held in pre-exilic Judaism with respect to the person of the Messiah. In the Psalms of Solomon he is represented as a human king, but as one to whom unique gifts, virtues,

<sup>1</sup> The "messenger" of Mal 3<sup>1</sup> seems to have been generally, though scarcely correctly, identified with "Elijah" of Mal 4<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> In Sib. ii. 187-199, reckoned to be of Christian origin, "the Thesbite" (Elias) is represented as coming from heaven and giving the world a triple sign.

and powers have been imported by the Holy Ghost, and in Sibyllines (iii. 49) he is similarly entitled "immaculate king" (ἀγνος ἄναξ). According to the still higher conception of Enoch, he is of a distinctly supernatural order, hidden with God before the world was (48<sup>o</sup>). The same idea occurs in 2 (4) Ezra (12<sup>32</sup>, 13<sup>24</sup>). This point of view affords an interesting parallel to the Platonic thought that everything of worth had a prior existence in heaven; but it cannot reasonably be attributed to Christian influence.

Respecting the manner of the Messiah's advent, it was believed that it would come suddenly "as a thief in the night" (1 Thess 5<sup>2</sup>), and that he would establish his identity by his miraculous works (Ju 7<sup>31</sup>, 9<sup>16</sup>). In none of these books of which we have taken a survey is there any reference to the Messiah as suffering or dying an expiatory death for the sin of the world; and it is significant that when our Lord appeared, such an idea was as alien to His own disciples as it was to His adversaries (Mt 16<sup>22</sup>; Mk 8<sup>31f.</sup>; Lk 18<sup>34</sup>, 24<sup>21</sup>; Jn 12<sup>34</sup>).

(β) *Final Onset and Destruction of the Hostile Heathen.*—The Sibyllines (iii. 663 ff.) and 4 Ezra (13<sup>33ff.</sup>) speak of an uprising of the heathen powers against the Messiah—a conception carried over into the NT, notably in the Epistles of John and 2 Thessalonians (1 Jn 2<sup>18</sup>, etc.; 2 Jn 7; 2 Thess 2; cf. Apoc. of Baruch and Rev 13), where the assault is led by "the deceiver and the antichrist." According to the Assumption of Moses (ch. 10) and Enoch (90<sup>18</sup>), God Himself will break the power of the heathen, who will then surrender to Israel (90<sup>30</sup>), but judgement will overtake the fallen angels and the apostate Jews (90<sup>20ff.</sup>). Usually, however, the overcoming of the adverse hosts is ascribed to the Messiah (Sib iii. 652 ff.; Philo, *De præm. et pœnis*, 16; Ps of Sol 17<sup>36ff.</sup>; Apoc. of Baruch 39<sup>7</sup>–40<sup>2</sup>, etc.; 2 (4) Ezra 12<sup>32f.</sup>, etc.). In 2 (4) Ezra and in Enoch the judgement is purely juridical (Ezra 7<sup>33ff. 69</sup>; 13<sup>37f.</sup>;

En 45<sup>8</sup>, 62<sup>1ff.</sup>, etc.), but the kings and the mighty will be handed over to the avenging angels (En 62<sup>1ff.</sup>). Thus while there is practical agreement as to the fact, there is no rigid uniformity regarding the mode of the destruction which will befall the aggressive forces of ungodliness.

(γ) *The Kingdom of the Future in the Holy Land.*—This is associated with (1) the new Jerusalem. In former days this was viewed simply as a holy city "purified from the heathen" (Ps of Sol 17<sup>25</sup>), but latterly a feeling arose that even so the earthly Jerusalem was unfit to be the ideal sacred city; "its heavenly counterpart, pure and pre-existent, must descend."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly it was represented as coming down from God out of heaven, whither it had been transferred from Paradise after Adam's transgression. Previously seen in vision by Abraham, Jacob, and Moses (Apoc. of Baruch 4<sup>2-6</sup>), it was similarly revealed to Ezra (2 (4) Ezra 10<sup>44ff.</sup>). At the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom this glorious city of transcendent beauty will replace the former Jerusalem (2 (4) Ezra 7<sup>26</sup>; En 53<sup>6</sup>, 90<sup>28f.</sup>)—an idea still current in NT times (Gal 4<sup>26</sup>; Heb 12<sup>22</sup>; Rev 3<sup>12</sup>, 21<sup>2.10</sup>). (2) The gathering of the dispersed under the government of the Messiah (Ps of Sol 11; Baruch 4<sup>36f.</sup>, 5<sup>5ff.</sup>). Philo represents them as flocking to Zion, led by a divine manifestation (*De excer.* 8-9). According to the Psalms of Solomon, they are gathered by the Messiah himself (17<sup>28</sup>). In 2 (4) Ezra the ten tribes are spoken of as returning from Azareth<sup>2</sup>—a region "where never mankind dwelt," to which they had retired "that they might there keep their statutes," the Most High drying up the springs of the Euphrates that they might pass through (13<sup>39ff.</sup>). (3) The direct rule of the Most High. In its ultimate form the Messianic kingdom will be in reality, and in the NT sense, the "kingdom of God" as distinguished

<sup>1</sup> Moffatt on Rev 21<sup>2</sup>, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. "another land," v. 40. See Dt 29<sup>28</sup>.

from the kingdoms of this world. Although having the Messiah at its head, the glorious kingdom of the future will be under the supreme sway of the Almighty Himself (Sib. iii. 704 ff., etc. ; Ps of Sol 17<sup>1</sup>. 38. 51). It is, in fact, His presence with men that constitutes the whole worth of the new Jerusalem (En 62<sup>14</sup> ; Test. Jud. 25, etc.).

It was held as axiomatic that the future Messianic kingdom would be centred in Jerusalem. Nevertheless it was regarded as extending to the world in general (Dn 2<sup>14</sup>, 7<sup>14</sup>. 17) without limitation of race or speech. In the Sibyllines the heathen are represented as being so impressed with the bliss of the divine kingdom that they voluntarily embrace the true religion, but in general they are pictured as adhering to the rule of the Messiah because of his God-given power (En 90<sup>30</sup> ; Ps of Sol 17<sup>32-35</sup> ; Sib. iii. 49 ; Apoc. Baruch 7<sup>25</sup>). The most extreme form of this idea occurs in the Assumption of Moses, in which the desire is expressed that Israel should tread upon the neck of the eagle (10<sup>8</sup>). In the Book of Jubilees Jacob's seed are assured of universal dominion, and in Ro 4<sup>16</sup> Abraham is spoken of as the heir of the world, the meaning apparently being that he should inherit the land of Canaan taken as a type of the universal Messianic reign, and that in one of his descendants all the world should be blessed.

The Messianic period is uniformly depicted as one of prosperity, joy, and peace. Men will live long and pursue their labour with strength and gladness (Philo, *De præm. et. pænis*, 17-18), and wild beasts become tame (Sib. iii. 620-623, etc. ; Apoc. Baruch 73<sup>41</sup>). Among God's people there will be no unrighteousness (Ps of Sol 17<sup>281</sup>, etc.), and they will render to Him a constant and holy service (cf. Lk 7<sup>28</sup>).

In some of the Jewish writings of the period a limit is set to the duration of the Messiah's kingdom. According to the Apoc. of Baruch he will reign in perpetuity until the corruption of the world is ended. Similarly in

2 (4) Ezra 12<sup>34</sup> it is stated that he will make God's people joyful till the coming of the day of judgement, a period of four hundred years (7<sup>28f.</sup>). In Rev 20<sup>4-6</sup> the duration of his kingdom is set down as a thousand years, but all such figures in this book have "a symbolical, not a numerical, value."<sup>1</sup>

(δ) *The New Heaven and the New Earth*.—By the end of the second century B.C. it was the general persuasion that this present world could never be the scene of the eternal Messianic kingdom. As a kingdom within man the coming Kingdom of God is to some extent to be realized on earth, but "can attain its consummation only in the world to come, into which the righteous shall enter through the gate of resurrection."<sup>2</sup> As is clear from the NT, a sharp distinction was drawn between this world and the world to come (Mt 12<sup>32</sup>; Mk 10<sup>30</sup>; Lk 18<sup>30</sup>), but there seems to have been no fixed opinion as to when the present world would come to an end and the new world begin. According to En 25<sup>4f.</sup>, the new world will date from the commencement of Messiah's reign, but in 2 (4) Ezra 7<sup>31</sup> it is represented as only coming into existence seven days after the death of the Messiah. Thus in the one case the Messianic age<sup>3</sup> belongs to the present world, and in the other it is assigned to the future, and follows only upon the final judgement. The Apocalypse of Baruch represents it as intermediate between the two worlds (74<sup>2f.</sup>).

(ε) *The Resurrection and the Last Judgement*.—Apart from the denial of the resurrection by the Sadducees, and the substitution for it of the immortality of the soul, the belief in the reawakening of the dead, already distinctly affirmed in Dn 12<sup>2</sup>, had become a general article of

<sup>1</sup> Charles, *Between the Old and New Testaments*, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> Milligan, *Expositor's Bible*.

<sup>3</sup> The term *Messianic*, it may be noted, is now generally applied not strictly to what relates to the Messiah's person and work, but to everything connected with Jewish hopes and beliefs concerning the last things.

faith (2 Macc 7<sup>9</sup>, etc. ; En 51<sup>1</sup> ; Ps of Sol 3<sup>12</sup> ; 2 (4) Ezra 7<sup>32</sup> ; and many other writings). The idea of an intermediate state found wide acceptance, and in the Apocalypse of Baruch (30<sup>2</sup>) and 2 (4) Ezra (4<sup>35</sup>, 41, 7<sup>32</sup>) mention is made of receptacles awaiting the souls of the righteous dead at the time of their decease. This belief is reflected in many passages of the NT (*e.g.* Lk 23<sup>43</sup> ; 2 Co 5<sup>8</sup> ; Ph 1<sup>23</sup>), although it had evidently assumed various forms. At first it was expected that the resurrection would be limited to the righteous (Ps of Sol 3<sup>12</sup>, 14<sup>2ff.</sup>) ; afterwards a general resurrection to judgement, conceived sometimes as preceding, at other times as following, the inauguration of the Messianic rule, became the prevalent creed. In Dn 12<sup>2</sup> and En 51<sup>1</sup> the resurrection and judgement are placed before, and in the Apocalypse of Baruch after, the Messianic age. According to the Book of Revelation, there will be a resurrection of the just on the eve of the Messiah's advent, and a second general resurrection when his kingdom reaches its close (20<sup>5f.</sup>, 12<sup>f.</sup>). The dead rise at the sounding of the trump of God (1 Thess 4<sup>16</sup> ; 1 Co 15<sup>52</sup> ; cf. 2 (4) Ezra 6<sup>23</sup> ; Mt 24<sup>31</sup>).

In most of the Jewish writings of post-Maccabaeen times the last judgement is simultaneous with the destruction of the pagan powers anterior to the Messianic rule. The Apocalypse of Baruch and 2 (4) Ezra, however, foreshadow a final judgement at its close. According to these books judgement will be pronounced on all—Jew and Gentile alike (Bar 51<sup>4f.</sup> ; 2 (4) Ezra 6<sup>20</sup>). God Himself will judge every one according to the record of his works contained in heavenly books (En 48<sup>7f.</sup> ; 2 (4) Ezra 6<sup>20</sup>, etc. ; cf. Dn 7<sup>10</sup> ; Mal 3<sup>16</sup> ; Rev 20<sup>12</sup>). The righteous will enter into a never-ending Paradise (Dn 12<sup>3</sup> ; Baruch 51<sup>3</sup>, 7-14 ; 2 (4) Ezra 13<sup>38</sup>), the ungodly will be consigned to the fires of Gehenna, the duration of their torment being sometimes conceived as temporal, and sometimes as eternal (Dn 12<sup>2</sup> ; Tests., Zebulon 10 ; Mt 3<sup>12</sup>, 25<sup>46</sup> ; Lk 3<sup>17</sup>).



## B. IN THE DISPERSION

(1) *The Facts concerning the Dispersion*

Dispersion (Greek *Διασπορά*) is the technical designation for all Jews not resident in Palestine. It is certain that more than a century before the Christian era there were Jewish settlers in every quarter of the civilized world. But with regard to the extent of the Dispersion in the pre-Maccabaeian period there is more uncertainty. And the most keenly debated point is just the degree to which it was affected by the Greek conquests in Asia. Until recently the influence thus exercised has never been questioned ; indeed, it has always been considered the main and indisputable factor in the case. In 1895, however, H. Willrich published his *Juden und Griechen*, in which he boldly contests the accuracy of the hitherto accepted Jewish tradition concerning the Hellenistic period, and asserts that that tradition is not borne out by the evidence obtainable from the Greek sources. According to this scholar, there was no Jewish dispersion in Egypt on any large scale until the time of Ptolemy vi. Philometor (B.C. 180-146). The Dispersion was really brought about by the Maccabaeian revolt. Anything relating to it which purports to belong to an earlier period is fabulous, and simply an invention on the part of Josephus. A supplementary volume in support of his general position, although containing modifications upon some points of detail, appeared in 1900 under the title *Judaica*. Willrich maintains that Schürer's treatment of the period from Alexander the Great to Antiochus Epiphanes is the vulnerable point in his great work upon the history of the Jewish people, but in a later edition Schürer characterizes the views of his critic as capable of being made good only through a series of violent critical operations, and as inconsistent with recently discovered records.<sup>1</sup> Nor is Schürer alone in thinking

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*<sup>8</sup>, iii. 19 n., 28.

that Willrich's methods are not such as to inspire confidence in his conclusions. Bertholet, for example, contends that as the result of his work quite as difficult riddles remain as those previously existing. In particular, Willrich gives no explanation of a Hellenistic drift (*Strömung*) among the Jews. Although he describes as "most interesting" the remark of Hecataeus of Abdera that through contact with Persians and Macedonians the Jews were in many respects led away from their usages, he simply cancels the narratives that throw some light upon the subject, without putting anything positive in their place.

The contention that there was virtually no Jewish dispersion prior to the Maccabaeian age rests, then, upon no substantial evidence. It is based upon mere general considerations. Its supporters allege that what information we possess regarding such a dispersion is the product of a period in which forged documents and highly coloured romances were made to do duty for history, and that with the express object of leading the heathen to believe that in previous times great kings had shewn special favour to the Jews. The question turns mainly upon the credibility of Josephus as a historian. Although this does not stand high, it seems rather drastic to refuse all credence to his meagre treatment of this period, and to set it down as nothing but fiction. Yet this is necessarily the position taken up by those who deny the existence of an early Diaspora. They regard the statements of Josephus as false, and the documents by which he seeks to substantiate them as forgeries. It must be conceded that the letter of Aristeeas concerning the origin of the Septuagint is spurious. But whether or not Willrich and his disciples are also right in denying a historical kernel to the story of the Tobiad Joseph, and in viewing as mythical the personalities of Eupolemus (1 Macc 8<sup>17</sup>) and Aristobulus (2 Macc 1<sup>10</sup>), their attitude is purely negative, and no positive evidence can be produced in

support of their contention. Every one, however, will agree with Willrich that this period is "perhaps the most interesting but also the most difficult chapter in the whole post-exilic history of the Jews"; and it may also be frankly admitted that previous to the age of the Maccabees the dispersion was on a meagre scale compared with that which it then attained.

The evidence for an early dispersion, although slight, is real and convincing so far as it goes. It may be shortly summarized as follows: (1) At the time of the Restoration many Jews remained in Babylonia, and their descendants lived on as settlers there. Alike in numbers and in wealth, they far exceeded the Jewish population of Palestine. (2) In the Greek and Roman periods communities of *other* Orientals existed in the commercial centres of the Mediterranean seaboard. In particular, large numbers of Phœnicians and Egyptians migrated thither. They spoke their own language and maintained their own religious observances. These corporations had obtained a footing in Athens even before the time of Alexander. There is documentary evidence that the Sidonians formed an organized community and had their own temple in the Piræus. Bilingual inscriptions on Sidonian tombs dating from the fourth to the third century B.C. are still extant. Of equal antiquity is an inscription (in Greek and Phœnician) recording the presentation of a votive offering to Apollo in Delos by the "sacred sailors of Tyre." A community of Tyrian merchants and sailors is also found existing in Delos at the beginning of the second century B.C.<sup>1</sup> In these parts, therefore, there were presumably Jewish settlers also. (3) It is significant that a "Jew from Coele-Syria, Hellenic not in speech only, but in soul," should have been introduced by Clearchus of Soli as a character in one of his dialogues and represented as conversing with Aristotle during his sojourn in Asia Minor (B.C. 348-345).<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> See further, Schürer, *op. cit.* iii. 56 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, *c. Apion*, i. 22.

natural inference from this is that at the time when Clearchus wrote, the Hellenized Jew was no uncommon figure in Asia. (4) The Egyptian papyri prove that under the earlier Ptolemies both Jews and Samaritans had spread themselves over the land and formed in many of the towns and villages no inconsiderable part of the population.<sup>1</sup> (5) In 1 Macc 5 it is recorded that in response to an appeal from the Jews who suffered oppression at the hands of the heathen in the Syrian districts of Galilee and Gilead, Judas Maccabæus and his brothers, Jonathan and Simon, went to their relief and transported them in a body to Judæa.

Assuming, then, that even before the Maccabaean revolt a considerable dispersion of Jews had taken place, we can distinguish the main groups or divisions of non-Palestinian Jews as found existing in the first century B.C. (1) Jews beyond the Euphrates. Ever since the deportations to Assyria and Babylonia there had been Jewish residents in the trans-Euphratic regions. There was no return of the Ten Tribes, and only a very partial return of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. The examples of Nehemiah and Esther show that some of the exiles rose to honour at the Persian court; and the fact that so few availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to Palestine indicates that their condition was not one of severe oppression. About B.C. 340, however, numerous Jewish captives were deported by Artaxerxes Ochus to the shores of the Caspian Sea. From their geographical position on the eastern frontier of the Roman Empire the Babylonian and Mesopotamian Jews were frequently a source of concern to the imperial legates. According to Josephus they were chiefly massed in the cities of Nehardea and Nisibis. By their Palestinian brethren they were held in high esteem. (2) Jews in Syria and Asia Minor. In founding Antioch, Seleucus conferred on the Jews, if not altogether equal rights with

For details, see Schürer, *op. cit.* iii. 22 ff.

the Greek citizens, at all events substantial concessions in respect of their religion. This made the Syrian capital a favourite resort of Jewish settlers, who were also numerous in Damascus and other cities of Syria. Throughout Asia Minor, too, they were found in great numbers. While, according to Philo, "every city" had its Jewish inhabitants, these were particularly prominent in the commercial seaports of the Ægean from Ephesus to Troas. An important item in the dispersion in "Asia" was the transference by Antiochus the Great of two thousand Jewish families from the eastern provinces to the disaffected districts of Lydia and Phrygia.<sup>1</sup> (3) Jews of Egypt and Cyrenaica. Of special importance historically was the Jewish dispersion in Egypt. This had already begun in the time of Jeremiah,<sup>2</sup> but did not assume large proportions until the foundation of Alexandria, where from the first many Jews and Samaritans enjoyed the rights of citizenship. Under the Ptolemies their numbers were swelled by new accessions until they formed a considerable element in the population. The Egyptian Jews bore a leading part in the struggle between Judaism and paganism down to the days of the Roman Emperor Trajan (A.D. 98-117). There was also a considerable Jewish settlement in "the parts of Libya about Cyrene," on the northern coast of Africa. The Second Book of Maccabees is an epitome of a work by Jason of Cyrene, a Hellenistic Jew. (4) Jews in Greece and Italy. The Fourth Gospel expressly mentions "the dispersion among the Greeks."<sup>3</sup> In the Acts reference is made to the Jewish synagogues at Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth. Many Jews had also migrated to Cyprus, Crete, and other islands of the Mediterranean.<sup>4</sup> Commercial travelling like that of Lydia, and of Aquila and Priscilla,<sup>5</sup> must have been in vogue at a considerably earlier date, and the islands of the Archipelago no doubt

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Jer., chaps. 42-44.

<sup>3</sup> Jn 7<sup>35</sup>: τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Macc 15<sup>23</sup>. <sup>5</sup> Ac 16<sup>14</sup>, 18<sup>18</sup>.

served as stepping-stones for the advance of Judaism. From the age of the Maccabees Jews began to appear in Italy,<sup>1</sup> and after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey in B.C. 63 they formed a large independent community in Rome. They took up their quarters beyond the Tiber, and proved an important factor in the civil and military life of the empire.

(2) *The Political and Municipal Standing of the Jews of the Dispersion*

This varied with the different State regulations to which they were subject. In Greece and in Rome they were legally recognized as voluntary religious associations, and lived under conditions not unfavourable to their material prosperity. Throughout the Roman Empire not only was toleration extended to them, but they were also exempted from military service, and were allowed a free hand in the management of their own funds and full jurisdiction over the members of their own community. Augustus decreed that no Jew should be obliged to attend a court of law on the Sabbath. The first sharp collision between the imperial authorities and the Jews took place in the days of Caligula, when they were ordered to join in the worship of that emperor. Under the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ they were almost uniformly treated with toleration. In Ephesus and Cyrene, in the metropolitan cities of Antioch and Alexandria, and in practically all the towns built in the Hellenistic period, they enjoyed, if not the full, at least valuable rights of citizenship. This was a position to which all Jews aspired, though it frequently led to their being disliked by their fellow-townsmen, who resented their refusal to worship the local gods. In this way the social standing of the Jews was usually inferior to that of their Gentile neighbours; yet sometimes they took a leading part in public life, and held responsible office.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Macc 8<sup>17</sup>, 14<sup>24</sup>.

Under the Ptolemies, for instance, Jews were commanders-in-chief of the Egyptian army; and under the Roman dominion Alexander, the brother of Philo, was appointed alabarch.<sup>1</sup> Not a few Jews of the Diaspora possessed also the rights of Roman citizenship.<sup>2</sup>

### (3) *Relation of Foreign Jews to the Mother-Country*

The foreign Jews cherished a passionate love for their native land. All alike possessed the patriotic ardour expressed in the vow, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." They kept themselves in touch with the mother-country by the regular payment of the half-shekel<sup>3</sup> annually due as Temple tribute from every male Israelite over twenty years of age. After being paid into local offices, the money was conveyed to Jerusalem by men of recognized integrity. The main tie that bound the foreign Jews to Palestine, however, was the custom of making pilgrimages to the holy city at the time of the feasts. According to Philo, "Many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the Temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south."<sup>4</sup> If we reckon the normal population of the city at 90,000, the (doubtless exaggerated) figures given by Josephus would indicate that at such seasons it reached thirty times that number.<sup>5</sup> To the post-exilic Jew, Jerusalem thus became what Mecca is to the Mohammedan of to-day. Many pious ones must have been unable to make even one pilgrimage to the sacred city. But all such could enjoy the happy consciousness that they were nevertheless Jahweh's guests. By means of the synagogue there had been created a more spiritual conception of worship

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.*, "chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile" (Schürer).

<sup>2</sup> Ac 16<sup>37</sup>iii.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ διδραχμον = about 1s. 4d. sterling.

<sup>4</sup> *De Monarchia*, ii. 1. Cf. Ac 2<sup>9-11</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> *BJ*, vi. 9. 3.

than that represented by the symbolic ritual of the Temple. Without the intervention of priest or Levite, without animal sacrifices, they had direct fellowship with God through prayer and study of the Scriptures. Even if there were any special blessing attached to the sacrificial services in Jerusalem, it was not confined to those who took part in them. Wherever Jahweh's people were, they believed that by praying three times a day with their faces toward Jerusalem<sup>1</sup> they would share in the benefits bestowed on those who could offer their prayers in Mount Zion. In short, they had formed the idea of a spiritual temple, a house of Jahweh, in which they could dwell for ever,<sup>2</sup> and in which the sacrifices were praise and prayer. Only those, however, who were prepared to conform to a high moral standard could be guests in his tent.<sup>3</sup> This enlarged idea of guestship in relation to Jahweh was not the least of the religious results of the Dispersion. Finally, the ties that bound the foreign Jews to the mother-country were cemented by the due observance of the different festivals, so far as that was possible at a distance from the Temple. Although the Alexandrian Jews kept some special festivals of their own—they thus commemorated, for example, the translation of the Scriptures into Greek—they carefully respected the statutory ordinances of Palestinian Judaism; and although a Jewish temple was set up at Leontopolis<sup>4</sup> during the Maccabaeen struggle, Egyptian Jews still kept up their connexion with Jerusalem. "Scattered abroad" as they were over the whole of the civilized world, the Jews constituted a compact commonwealth firmly welded together and resting on immovable bases. What, then, was the essentially uniting bond between those resident in the homeland and those in foreign parts? Certainly not merely that of nationality, though all alike detested the yoke of Rome, but

<sup>1</sup> Dn 6<sup>10</sup>.<sup>2</sup> Ps 23.<sup>3</sup> Ps 15.<sup>4</sup> Claimed to have been discovered by Flinders Petrie in 1905.



also and in particular that of Church fellowship. Everywhere they breathed the same spiritual atmosphere—that of the Bible and the synagogue, of the Sabbath and feast-days. The yearly tribute for the Temple treasury at Jerusalem was conscientiously paid, but that the significance of the Temple worship gradually dwindled is incontestably proved by the fact that even the destruction of the sacred shrine could not sap the vitality of Jewish piety. The worship of the Synagogue had in truth superseded that of the Temple, and become the centre of religious life. By reason of this strong bond of unity, and the consciousness of easy superiority to other religions springing from the strength of its morality, Judaism became confidently aggressive and entered upon a policy of propagandism.

#### (4) *Proselytes to Judaism*

An important aspect of the Judaism of the Diaspora is that connected with the name "proselytes." In earlier times the term "stranger" (גֵּר) was used to denote a person of another nationality dwelling within the Jewish community,<sup>1</sup> but already by the time of the Chronicler it seems to have been used technically in a wider sense.<sup>2</sup> Latterly, at any rate, it came to include all of foreign extraction who had embraced the Jewish religion, no matter where they lived. The stranger became the "righteous stranger" (גֵּר צַדִּיק), or the "proselyte" (προσήλυτος) of the Talmudic literature. Though all alike converts from heathenism, proselytes appear to have differed in the degree of their attachment to Judaism. Through circumcision some had qualified themselves for admission to the entire privileges and fellowship of the Jewish ritual and worship; others were content with shewing their esteem for the Mosaic religion by attending the synagogue and by observing the

<sup>1</sup> Ex 20<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Chron 30<sup>25</sup>.

Sabbath and the prescriptions of the ceremonial law with reference to meats. In the New Testament the latter are termed the "God-fearing" (*φοβούμενοι* or *σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν*).<sup>1</sup>

Not only in Palestine, but wherever there was a Jewish community, proselytes existed in considerable numbers.<sup>2</sup> This may appear surprising in view of the many gratuitous slanders in circulation against the Jews, in view of the ridicule poured upon them by pagan writers on account of their abstinence from swine's flesh, their Sabbath observance and their imageless worship, and in view also of their despised social position. On the other hand, it must be remembered that men were losing faith in the old religions of Greece and Rome and were inclined to look favourably on Oriental cults in general. Through the post-Aristotelian philosophy and the Greek translation of the OT the ground had been prepared for the seed of Judaism. In these circumstances it owed much to the tact of its advocates in keeping its attractive side to the front. As a religion, too, it appealed to the deepest yearnings of the human spirit, in so far as it alone among the faiths of the ancient world could suggest a way of deliverance from sin and sorrow. These things account for the power which Judaism had to attract foreigners. Along with representatives of the humbler classes, the ranks of the proselytes included a certain proportion of aristocratic, and even of royal, personages.<sup>3</sup> There is reason to suppose that, especially under the Ptolemies and after the military successes of the Mac-

<sup>1</sup> Bertholet rejects the distinction, holding that there was only one category of proselytes, and that all the uncircumcised were accounted heathen. In Ac 13<sup>43</sup> *σεβόμενοι* are certainly conjoined with *προσήλυτοι*.

<sup>2</sup> "There is not a single town among the Greeks or barbarians, or anywhere else, not a single nation to which the observance of the Sabbath as it exists among ourselves has not penetrated; while fasting and the burning of lights and many of our laws with regard to meats are also observed" (Josephus, *c. Apion*, ii. 39).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ac 8<sup>27</sup>; Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 2-4. 7-1. 3; *BJ* ii. 19. 2.

cabees,<sup>1</sup> a number of foreigners attached themselves to the Jewish community in Palestine. In Pss 115, 118, 135, there seems to be a clear allusion to the presence of proselytes in the post-exilic congregation. Three different classes of persons are exhorted to trust God and acknowledge his mercy, namely (1) Israel, *i.e.* the laity in general; (2) the house of Aaron, *i.e.* the priests; (3) those that fear Jahweh, *i.e.* in all probability the proselytes; seeing they are singled out as a distinct class, who else can they be? No doubt the expression is frequently used in the Psalter as a general designation for the faithful, but latterly it was a recognized technical term for the proselytes, and unless we are very sure that these psalms were written before the Greek period, we cannot hesitate as to the identification. The anticipation of the accession to the Jewish church of nations, as well as individuals, contained in Is 19<sup>18ff.</sup> and in Ps 87 shews that there were foreigners already within her pale when these pieces were penned. Through the development of the process of conversion already inaugurated, the happy time seemed coming on apace when Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and every other country under heaven would share with Israel the privilege of being Jahweh's inheritance. In the psalm Zion is prophetically celebrated as the centre of a universal Church.

The proper attitude toward foreigners was a burning question for post-exilic Judaism. It is clear that the position of orthodox legalists, as championed by Ezra and Nehemiah, was hotly contested, and after the death of these influential leaders the party favourable to a less rigorous policy must have regained strength. By the time of Antiochus iv. Epiphanes, many Jews were eager for Hellenization. Protests against the admission of foreign elements no doubt continued to be made, but there was also a directly opposing tendency. The re-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Macc 5<sup>14-54</sup>.

ligious experience of the age, if sometimes exhibiting a particularistic vein,<sup>1</sup> frequently assumes a wider outlook,<sup>2</sup> stress being laid, not upon the contrast between Jew and non-Jew, but upon the contrast between God and man. A distinctly missionary impulse underlies many of the psalms,<sup>3</sup> and the conversion of the heathen is a leading note of the Messianic aspirations which they breathe.<sup>4</sup> While containing expressions of bitterness toward those outside the pale of Judaism, the Psalter makes it equally clear that the Jewish mind had formed the conception of a Kingdom of God such as we look for in vain in any other pre-Christian community. There is, in fact, a strong tendency toward universalism, on more practical lines than those adumbrated in the prophetic books. In the imagination of the prophets those of the heathen who had "separated themselves from the people of the lands" and embraced with more or less fulness the Mosaic law,<sup>5</sup> were portrayed as coming up in great concourse to Zion, the centre of revelation, to share in the blessings of Jacob's house.<sup>6</sup>

### (5) *Jewish Propagandism*

If these hopes were ever to be realized, however, it was essential that something should be done to propagate Jewish principles. The ideal demand of prophetic universalism must find its fitting response in actual missionary enterprise. And to this work the community evidently felt itself called.<sup>7</sup> Active efforts in this direction accordingly began to be made soon after the founding of the Samaritan community. In the Greek and Roman periods the Alexandrian Jews and the Palestinian vied with one another in the aggressive zeal with which they

<sup>1</sup> Pss 33<sup>12</sup>, 79<sup>9</sup>; cf. Jer 10<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Pss 67, 82<sup>9</sup>, 86<sup>9</sup>, 87<sup>4</sup>, 102<sup>15</sup>; Zech 2<sup>11</sup>, 8<sup>13</sup>, 22<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Pss 9<sup>20</sup>, 119<sup>46</sup>, 150<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Ps 96<sup>3</sup>. 10 etc.

<sup>5</sup> Neh 10<sup>28f.</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Mic 4<sup>1-2</sup>; Is 2<sup>2f.</sup>; Ezek 47<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Pss 57<sup>9</sup>, 96, 105<sup>1</sup>, 108<sup>3</sup>.

brought the claims of Judaism before the heathen world. The Hasmonæan rulers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus did not hesitate to force circumcision upon the people of Idumæa and Ituræa. Down to the time of our Lord an active propaganda was carried on. Even the Pharisees with all their exclusiveness were ready to "compass sea and land to make one proselyte." The means employed in this enterprise were not always too scrupulous, as evidenced, for example, by the pretence of the Alexandrian Philo that Plato and other philosophers had borrowed from Moses!

Yet that considerable success attended the effort to popularize the Jewish faith among foreigners in quest of a religion may be inferred from the fact that the zealous Jew became the butt of Roman satirists,<sup>1</sup> and possibly also from the incident recorded of the Greeks in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>2</sup> The most brilliant achievement of Jewish proselytism was the conversion of Izates, king of Idiabene, with his entire household. In Apostolic times there appears to have been no slackening of these strenuous endeavours to gather in the heathen, and the resultant "proselytes" formed no unimportant link between Jewish and Gentile Christians. The combination of Jews and "God-fearing" proselytes in the synagogues of the Dispersion furnished the Apostle Paul and his companions with a unique opportunity of disseminating the Gospel. According to Josephus, "a vast multitude of Greeks" became proselytes in Antioch, while in Damascus most of the women were attracted to Judaism. Relatively to Christian missions these were of the highest importance, and from their ranks the Apostle Paul drew many of his converts.

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Sat.* i. 4, 142 f.; 9, 68-72; Persius, *Sat.* v. 179-184; Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 160; xiv. 96-106. To this zealous propaganda, witnessed by the claim to moral and religious superiority, was largely attributable the strong anti-Semitic feeling expressed by Tacitus and other writers.

<sup>2</sup> Jn 12<sup>20ff.</sup>. These, however, were probably proselytes.

(6) *Treatment of Proselytes by born Jews*

Eager as they were to secure proselytes, the sons of Abraham were not prepared to recognize these as their equals. Theoretically, foreign converts were on a level with actual Jews both as regards duties and rights; nevertheless in point of fact they were treated as their inferiors. Whatever his antecedents, the proselyte, as one comparatively unversed in the Holy Scriptures, had to adopt the humble attitude expressed in Ps 131: "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty: neither do I exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me. . . . My soul is even as a weaned child." That some powerful voices were raised in favour of liberal treatment of devout foreigners is clear from the prophecy of Is 56<sup>1-8</sup>. If the Book of Ruth is post-exilic, we may also interpret that exquisite idyllic story as a plea for the admission of foreign wives who adopted the faith of their Jewish husbands. But the stern attitude of Ezra upon this point was still maintained by the orthodox, and in general the position of a proselyte was analogous to that of a converted Jew among Christians in modern times.<sup>1</sup>

(7) *1 Peter addressed to Christian Jews of the Dispersion*

It is noteworthy that one of the NT Epistles, that of 1 Peter, is specially addressed to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." In this case they were manifestly Christian Jews—Jews who had accepted Jesus as the Messiah, and had carried with them into other lands their Christian faith and hope. The five provinces here specified were all situated in Asia Minor, the collective home of one of the four well-marked groups of non-Palestinian Jews. Although several of these churches had been founded by Paul, this did not prevent the Apostle Peter from writing

<sup>1</sup> See Note 4, p. 387.

to them. Perhaps some of these Christians were personally known to him, but even if that were not so, he was large-hearted enough to make it quite natural for him to send them his good wishes and Christian counsels. In a wider sense this Epistle was addressed to all Christians throughout those provinces who, as "strangers and pilgrims in the earth" and "the elect . . . of God the Father," were as seeds of Christian truth in the lands of their dispersion.

In more general terms the Epistle of James is addressed to "the twelve tribes scattered abroad," so that the apostles were not only by no means unmindful of their fellow-Christians who had migrated to foreign countries, but also apparently had in view the welfare of all Jews throughout the world. This may perhaps account for the comparative lack of any distinctively Christian doctrine in this Epistle.

PART TWO  
THE LITERARY BACKGROUND





## CHAPTER I

### THE OLD TESTAMENT WRITINGS

EVEN considered strictly as literature, the OT exercised a predominant influence upon the writers of the NT Epistles. As is well known, their (often somewhat inexact) quotations, where not given loosely from memory, are made mostly from the Greek translation prepared for the Alexandrian Jews in the third century B.C., and designated the Septuagint from a legendary story that it was the work of seventy (or rather seventy-two, being six for each of the Twelve Tribes) translators sent from Jerusalem in response to the request of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (B.C. 284-247). In the Epistles the quotations from the Septuagint are far more numerous than those from either later Jewish literature or from pagan writers. The reverence with which, as containing the oracles of God, it was at first regarded by the Jewish people generally, as well as by the early Christians, rendered it an unrivalled weapon in the hands of the authors of NT books. By citing its words they could always convey instruction, point a moral, or adorn a tale. Their attitude is reflected in the claim that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable" (2 Tim 3<sup>16</sup>). The OT is thus woven into the very texture of most of the books composing the New, and this certainly holds good with respect to the Epistles, all of which, with the exception of the Johannine letters, and of those to Titus and Philemon, reflect more or less the thought and phraseology of the OT as mediated through the Septuagint. In this connexion our interest centres largely in the Apostle Paul. To what extent is he indebted to the

OT? According to Beyschlag indeed "his substantial dependence on the letter of the OT is very little. . . . He only proves from the OT what is already certain to him, apart from it, from his Christian experience and the inspiration of the Spirit, and he treats it with a freedom which often seems caprice, in contrast to our methodical exposition."<sup>1</sup> It may not be easy to dispute this, and yet it does seem unduly to minimize the apostle's debt to the OT, which he evidently regarded as infallible and authoritative (1 Co 9<sup>8</sup>), while not expressly claiming for it verbal inspiration. Recently many have been exercised about the proper attitude of Christians toward the OT. On this point let it suffice here to observe (1) that, broadly speaking, and without discussing such matters as the alleged anti-Christian elements of the cursing psalms and the slaughter of the Canaanites, its varied writings were accepted by Jesus and Paul as "the Scriptures," fraught with vital significance for the life and work of the Messiah (Lk 4<sup>21</sup>; Ro 15<sup>4</sup>; 1 Co 15<sup>4</sup>; 1 Tim 5<sup>18</sup>; 2 Tim 3<sup>16</sup>); (2) that they formed a necessary background without which the central Figure in the foreground could not be clearly seen, or, as it may be otherwise expressed, they supplied the site upon which was to be reared the edifice of Christianity.

Approximately, some 220 quotations or direct reminiscences of the OT are found in the NT Epistles. Of these some 25 occur oftener than once. More than half of the whole number are met with in Hebrews, Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 1 Peter; 2 Corinthians, with 16 quotations, comes next, and Galatians, Ephesians, and James contain 12 each. It seems unnecessary to set down the OT passages here; many will recur to every reader, and the whole can be easily glimpsed by reference to Moffatt's translation of the NT, in which they are printed in *italics*.

<sup>1</sup> *NT Theology*, II. p. 21 f.

## CHAPTER II

### POST-CANONICAL JEWISH LITERATURE

NEXT in importance to the OT as furnishing the literary background of the NT Epistles must be reckoned the extensive post-canonical Jewish Literature issued during the two centuries immediately preceding the Christian era and the first century and a half A.D. This is represented by the writings technically termed the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT.

The Apocrypha, while excluded from the Hebrew canon, were given a place in the Alexandrian Septuagint and in the Latin Vulgate. All except the Prayer of Manasses and 1 and 2 (4) Esdras were recognized as canonical by the Council of Trent (1546), the accepted books consisting of Tobit, Judith, the Additions to Esther, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch (with the Epistle of Jeremiah), the Song of the Three Holy Children, the History of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees.<sup>1</sup> In Coverdale's Bible (1535) they appeared for the first time separately at the end of the OT. They were included in most copies of the Geneva Bible (1560), and in most English Bibles till about the end of the seventeenth century. It is true, however, to say that at the Reformation the Protestant Church practically adopted the Hebrew Bible, and the Roman Catholic Church the Greek Bible. Apart from the question of canonicity, the Apocryphal

<sup>1</sup> A useful brief introduction is "The Apocryphal Books," by Andrews in the *Century Bible Handbooks*. See also Schürer, *HJP* (II., III.); Fritzsche and Grimm, *Kurzegefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch*; Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alt. Test.*

books are valuable for the light they shed on Jewish history and aspirations during the period between the Testaments. In this respect 1 Maccabees is a record of outstanding worth, while the other books reflect more or less the internal condition and religious standpoint of post-exilic Judaism.

Here we have to do solely with the question concerning their influence upon the NT Epistles. Although the NT contains no direct quotation from the Apocrypha, not a few passages indicate acquaintance with these books, and of such passages not a few occur in the Epistles, especially in James, in Romans, and in Hebrews. They are, however, virtually limited to reminiscences or coincidences relating to Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon.

(1) The Epistle of James shews many traces of the influence of these two books. The use of the term "upbraid" in Ja 1<sup>5</sup> and in Ecclus 20<sup>15</sup>, 41<sup>22</sup>; of "double-minded" in Ja 1<sup>8</sup> and in Ecclus 2<sup>12</sup>; of "crown of life" in Ja 1<sup>12</sup> and "crown of rejoicing" in Ecclus 1<sup>11</sup> and "crown of wisdom" in Ecclus 1<sup>18</sup>; the denial that men are tempted of God in Ja 1<sup>13</sup> and in Ecclus 15<sup>11f.</sup>; the injunction "Be swift to hear" in Ja 1<sup>19</sup> and in Ecclus 5<sup>11</sup>; the similitude of the mirror in Ja 1<sup>23</sup> and Ecclus 12<sup>11</sup>; the value attached to the visiting of the afflicted in Ja 1<sup>29</sup> and in Ecclus 7<sup>34f.</sup>; and the likening of the tongue to a fire in Ja 3<sup>5f.</sup> and in Ecclus 28<sup>10</sup>, are among the parallelisms worthy of notice. This Epistle also contains not a few apparent reminiscences of the Book of Wisdom. With Ja 1<sup>11</sup> may be compared Wisd 2<sup>8</sup>, which speaks of the withering of flowers under the heat of the sun. The reference to the sacrifice of Isaac in Ja 2<sup>21</sup> and in Wisd 10<sup>5</sup>; that to the oppression of the righteous poor in Ja 2<sup>6</sup> and in Wisd 2<sup>10</sup>; the delineation of wisdom in Ja 3<sup>13, 17</sup> and in Wisd 7<sup>22-24</sup>; and the swiftly vanishing, shadowy character of human life as pictured in Ja 4<sup>14</sup> and in Wisd 5<sup>9-14</sup>, form some of the more conspicuous

instances of contact between the canonical Epistle and the brilliant Alexandrian work of the pseudo-Solomon. The reality of such contact is generally admitted.

(2) A decided similarity in thought and expression is traceable between Romans 1 and 9 and the Book of Wisdom. This is pointed out in a detailed list of passages printed in parallel columns by Sanday and Headlam (*Romans*, pp. 51-52, 267 ff.). The trend of the argument in Ch. i. with respect to natural religion, vv. 19-20, idolatry, vv. 21-23, and the moral degradation of the pagan world, vv. 24-32, shews that the apostle was no stranger to this notable Alexandrian work, which deserves indeed to rank as one of the principal storehouses from which he drew in building up his conception of Christianity. In Ro 9<sup>19-23</sup>, in connexion with Paul's doctrine of predestination, we find another conspicuous instance of indebtedness. Common also to him and the Book of Wisdom are the ideas of the irresistibility of the Divine power, the Divine long-suffering, and the contrast between the fate of God's enemies and His sons. The image of the potter is employed by both writers (Ro 9<sup>21</sup>; Wisd 15<sup>7</sup>), though scarcely with the same object.<sup>1</sup> While, however, Paul owed a debt to the Book of Wisdom in point of literary form, this did not in any case extend to the vital content of the Christian faith. If, for instance, the apostle derived from this source certain expressions indicative of the Divine power and forbearance, he borrowed nothing more. With some exceptions (*e.g.* 11<sup>23-26</sup>), the writer of Wisdom is bound by a narrow Jewish nationalistic spirit in sharp contrast to the wide sympathies of the apostle to the Gentiles, in whose thought the Divine purpose of love wholly transcends the limits of race.

(3) An obvious parallel to the characterization of the Son in Heb 1<sup>3</sup> as "the effulgence of (God's) glory and

<sup>1</sup> For other "possible" points of contact, see Gregg, *Wisdom of Solomon*, p. lviii. (Cambridge Bible).

the express image of his person" occurs in Wisd 7<sup>26</sup>. In the striking description of Wisdom there given it is said: "She is an effulgence from everlasting light, and an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness" (R.V.). It cannot, however, be definitely affirmed that this is the source of the language used in Heb 1<sup>3</sup>, since both *effulgence* and *image* are terms frequently used by Philo. Scholars are divided in their interpretation of *effulgence*, which may mean either a ray of light emanating from a luminary or the reflexion of it. Three ideas seem to be implied in the word: (1) independent existence, (2) derivation, (3) resemblance, and its occurrence along with *mirror* and *image* in Wisd 7<sup>26</sup> seems to point rather to reflexion than effulgence as the meaning intended.<sup>1</sup> A further echo of the Book of Wisdom may perhaps be found in Heb 4<sup>12</sup>. The NT writer speaks of the Word of God as "quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword," while the apocryphal author writes: "Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of the royal throne . . . bearing as a sharp sword thine unfeigned commandment" (18<sup>15f.</sup>). It may also be noted that the phrase "a place of repentance," Heb 12<sup>17</sup>, occurs in Wisd 12<sup>10</sup>, and that in Heb 11<sup>37f.</sup> reference is probably made to the Books of Maccabees. In view of the particulars adduced, it is not perhaps extravagant to claim that "the Book of Wisdom exercised no small influence upon the NT. Though not directly quoted, it belonged to the mental furniture of the NT writers. The extent to which such influence operated must remain indeterminate, but we should not be dealing fairly with the evidence, if we refused to allow that, out of the many coincidences between NT and Wisdom, some are due to a reminiscence, whether conscious or unconscious, of the earlier book." <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So Lünemann (in *Meyer*) and A. B. Davidson in *loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Gregg, *op. cit.* p. lx.

The Pseudepigrapha are even less generally known than the Apocrypha. Among those wholly or partly extant the following are of chief importance relatively to Jewish religion: The Book of Enoch (1 Enoch, Ethiopic Enoch), The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Book of Jubilees (Apocalypse of Moses), The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (2 Enoch, Slavonic Enoch), The Assumption of Moses, The Apocalypse of Baruch, The Ascension of Isaiah, The Sibylline Oracles, and The Psalter of Solomon.<sup>1</sup>

The Psalter of Solomon consists of short poems of Pharisaic authorship, dating probably from the middle of the last century B.C. (*i.e.* about the time of Pompey's death), and characterized by belief in the resurrection and glowing anticipation of the triumphant rule of the Messianic King. In 2 Enoch, of uncertain date, there is no mention of a Messiah, and no suggestion of the nearness of the end, as in other Jewish Apocalypses and in the NT. With these exceptions, the Pseudepigrapha practically all belong to the category of Apocalyptic writings.

Of this type of literature, developed in the Maccabaeon crisis, and vigorously pursued until about A.D. 120, the earliest and best example is the Book of Daniel. That these books were issued not under the writer's own names, but under those of venerated figures of Israel's past, was simply a fashion of the times, due partly to the expectation that thus the writings in question would command increased attention, and partly to the necessity for anonymity in view of the danger attending open advocacy of the interests of the oppressed in an age of

<sup>1</sup> On these works see Hilgenfeld, *Die Jüdische Apok.*; Langen, *Judentum in Palästina*; the excellent editions of most of them by R. H. Charles; Schürer, *HJP*, II. iii.); Kautzsch, *op. cit.* II.; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*; Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers*; Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*; Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*; and for a briefer notice the present writer's *Background of the Gospels*, p. 223 ff.



ruthless persecution. In form these writings are pseud-epigraphic prophecies purporting to be supernatural revelations. From an assumed standpoint in the distant past the writers predict the future history of Israel and of the world, and intentionally veil their meaning by the use of symbols, parables, and visions, although naturally they cease to be definite on reaching their own time, which is represented as the time of judgement and of Messianic deliverance. The aim throughout is at once didactic and hortatory: where the former element predominates, the chief object in view is the glorification of Judaism, or the unfolding of divine mysteries; where the reverse is the case, the main purpose is to comfort the godly and warn the sinner. Against the gloomy background of the present there stand out in bold relief the glories of the future. These apocalyptic writings did much not only to quicken the Messianic hope, but also to produce among the people that political unrest which culminated in the revolt against the Romans in A.D. 66. In many cases they were either the compositions of Jewish Christians or underwent interpolation at their hands.

Few will now endorse the opinion of Jost that these writings are "without significance for Jewish religious history."<sup>1</sup> Not only do they shew the trend of Jewish beliefs in the two pre-Christian centuries, but they bridge the otherwise unavoidable gap between the prophetic teaching and ideals of the OT and their fulfilment in Christianity. Scribism, of course, lay between, but although it did find in unfulfilled prophecy certain materials on which to build national hopes in days of bitter adversity, it was mainly concerned with the study of the Law and its application to the changed conditions of the time. It lacked vision, and failed to restrain within traditional grooves the revolutionary spirit of faith and hope which was not yet extinct in the nation, and could be stifled neither by pedantic legalism nor by

<sup>1</sup> *Gesch. des Judent. und seiner Sekten*, ii. p. 218 n.

the pessimistic chorus of apocalypse. While the new apocalyptic literature resembled OT prophecy in its claim to be a divine revelation, and in its emphatic assertion of the eschatological element already to the fore in Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah, it deviated from it in its view of the world and of world-history. Prophecy still clings to the hope that the world will be moulded after the pattern of the divine will, but the apocalypticist has frankly despaired of this world, and no longer expects to see it set right by the slow evolution of history. His point of view is supramundane : this world is speeding on to catastrophic destruction, and on its ruins will rise a new world in which the wicked shall have no part or lot. In view of the long-continued subjection of Israel to foreign domination the Apocalypticists came also to look on the providential government of the world from the standpoint of determinism. In the course of history all was ordered according to the counsels of God. The sufferings of the righteous formed an integral part of the present order of things : at the coming of the day of the Lord the supremacy of evil would cease, and their heathen oppressors, to whom the Apocalypticists denied the least element of good, would be consigned to eternal destruction. And thus arose the conception of everlasting torment, which in its apocalyptic form is so impressively reflected in the NT, and has exercised so potent an influence on Christian theology down to modern times.

Covert allusions to reigning tyrants were intelligible only to those who had the key. Another obvious advantage of the apocalyptic form was that in the presentation of a vision meticulous accuracy was not essential, and consequently criticism was out of place. The appeal was to the imagination rather than to the understanding, and the message was one of reassurance to men perplexed by the ways of Providence. Nor from this point of view was it either obscure or untrue : it enshrined the great

assertion, the momentous fact that human history is the working out of a divine purpose, and that in accordance therewith the world is moving on towards a final consummation. While, however, the writers all proclaim the fact of judgement, they vary in their delineations of the end. The punishment of the wicked is represented now as utter destruction, now as eternal torment. Nor is there a uniform meaning attached to "eternal"; in 1 En 10<sup>10</sup>, *e.g.* 500 years="an eternal life." But for the apocalyptists such considerations were not material. They were not writing systems of theology, but painting literary pictures, and for them, and for us too, the only matter of real importance, and about which there can be no dubiety, is the idea behind the pictures. It was wedded to no logical theory, but was the outcome of a passionate conviction founded upon the course of Jewish history and eager to give itself expression.

At the dawn of the Christian era apocalypse was the current form for the conveyance of religious ideas, and our Lord used it freely, while at the same time giving to it an enlarged content stamped with His own personality. This holds good also of the apostolic age. In point of fact, the influence of apocalypse, while specially prominent in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Book of Revelation, is manifest in the NT generally. It is traceable in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in Jude, and in the Epistles of Peter and John. In the use of "fire," *e.g.* in 2 Peter, we are brought directly into contact with apocalyptic thought. It is also found reflected in the writings of Paul. His teaching concerning the Kingdom, the resurrection, the last judgement, and Hades, is coloured with apocalyptic imagery. In his letters, however, he was not writing as a dogmatic theologian, but as a Christian evangelist using current forms and imagery, and not always careful to avoid inconsistency as between his eschatology and his gospel.

That apocalyptic literature, then, had a potent influence on the NT is beyond question. Its form, however, was made the vehicle of fresh conceptions amounting to a new revelation. As the older prophecy gave way to scribism, and scribism to apocalypse, so in its turn apocalypse proved too narrow a mould for the Gospel of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Schweitzer and others have argued, though unconvincingly, that the apocalyptic element in the Saviour's teaching contains His essential message, and that everything else falls within the category of an "Interimsethik." The ethical side of our Lord's teaching cannot, however, so easily be relegated to a subordinate position as a mere temporary arrangement pending the dénouement of a world speeding to a catastrophic close. We need an ethical God—One whom we can trust, love, and obey—and ethics is an essential element in Christianity. The declaration, "The Son of man shall come in his glory" (Mt 16<sup>27</sup>, 25<sup>31</sup>), must be read alongside of that other, "The Kingdom of God is within (or among) you" (Lk 17<sup>21</sup>). Jesus sets the appeal of present and future in harmonious combination. In His mind both elements exist in stable equilibrium. Neither aspect of His teaching can be minimized or treated as of secondary importance. That any theory or interpretation of the religion of Jesus which ignores this must be regarded as one-sided and misleading is clear from the NT Epistles, in which equal stress is laid upon attention to the duties of the present and to the contemplation of the glory to follow when the Kingdom shall emerge in full splendour and Christ "shall have delivered it up to God, even the Father" (1 Co 15<sup>24</sup>). This is written practically on every page of the apostolic letters, and needs no proof. Nor is it without significance that in those very passages of both Gospels and Epistles which speak of the Second Advent it is emphatically declared that "on the throne of his glory" (Mt 25<sup>31</sup>) the Son of

<sup>1</sup> See Note 3, p. 386.

man will "reward every man according to his works" (Mt 16<sup>27</sup>). It is difficult to think how the very basis of the judgement, namely, "the deeds done in the body" (2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>)—in other words, the ethical standard attained—can be belittled as of inferior value. Yet Schweitzer's theory would rule out this crucial point.<sup>1</sup> However, the great asseveration of the apocalyptists—that the world is moving towards a moral consummation—has been definitely retained in the Christian gospel. Their principal theme is the era of the world to come, with the "general assize at which all wrong will be put right."

Largely as the result of the persecution under Antiochus iv. Epiphanes and the sharp conflict of ideas between their religion and Greek civilization, the Jews came to entertain the expectation of an early manifestation of the Kingdom of God through His sudden intervention for behoof of His saints. This was also the conviction of the first preachers of Christianity (1 Thess 5<sup>2</sup>). And it is noteworthy that after the destruction of the Jewish State both Rabbinism and Christianity adjusted themselves to the new conditions. Christians still clung to the apocalyptic idea, but the Rabbis rejected it, and when the Christian hope that the new æon was on the point of being ushered in began to wane, the books which proclaimed it naturally lost their charm. But although the new age was not of the character anticipated in the apocalyptic writings, it did really come in the form of the Christian religion, which was inaugurated by the announcement, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The Christian Church had become firmly embedded in the Græco-Roman civilization, and found a new world in the brotherhood of believers. In this way, and with some justification, it gained the consciousness of being in itself the fulfilment of the ideas contained in the apocalypses.

<sup>1</sup> His refusal to accept some of the Epistles (notably 2 Thess) as genuine does not greatly help his case in view of the combined testimony of other admittedly genuine Epistles.

The New Age was not indeed that adumbrated by the apocalyptists, but their invincible hope in the future, and in the ultimate triumph of right over wrong, remains an abiding heritage and inspiration for the people of God.

Without entering upon any detailed treatment of the apocalyptic writings in respect of date, contents, textual criticism, and other matters of *Introduction*, we may briefly refer to some features of special interest connected with them.

1. Dr. Burkitt has rightly stressed the value of 1 Enoch and similar books as teaching that running through "the confused drama of history" there is a purpose, a movement toward the final establishment of the right by the Judge of all the earth. "It is," he says, "by the doctrine of a purpose underlying history, and of an unerring Judgement to be pronounced upon it some-when, somewhere, that these books still strike a chord in our hearts to-day."<sup>1</sup>

2. It may seem strange that the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, written in the time of John Hyrcanus, should contain so much elementary instruction in Jewish ethics, but the key is supplied by the historical situation. Outside of Judæa there were few pure Jews in Palestine. According to 1 Macc 5<sup>23ff.</sup> Judas and his brother Simon, in response to the appeal of their distressed brethren, transported to Judæa the Jewish residents in Galilee and Gilead, to free them from molestation by the surrounding pagan population. Later on, the Jewish dominion was established over the adjacent regions, and the inhabitants, who were a mixture of the remnants of the Ten Tribes and a larger contingent of Gentile extraction, were constrained to adopt Jewish rites. Under the later Hasmonaeans these restored and newly created Israelites were exhorted to become loyal adherents of Levi as represented by the priest-king John Hyrcanus. They stood, however, in much need of education not only

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 33.

in the ritual of the Law, but also in the principles of Jewish morality. It was further deemed necessary that they should be taught to cherish the social sentiments and share the patriotic spirit of the elect people, and it appears to have been the special aim of the Testaments to meet these requirements.

3. In the Assumption of Moses (10<sup>10</sup>) we meet with the ferocious idea that in the New Age one great element in the satisfaction of the Elect will be that in their heavenly exaltation they will be able to behold and gloat over the fate of the Gentiles consigned by the vengeance of the Most High to condign and eternal punishment. The same idea finds earlier expression, however, in En 62<sup>12</sup>, and seems to be implied in 27<sup>3</sup> and 48<sup>9</sup> of the same book.

4. The Ascension of Isaiah is remarkable for the way in which, while asserting the nearness of the end, it combines with this the Christian idea of the Incarnation of the Messiah. As an event already past, this does not fit in well with the literary form of apocalypse, which always points to the future. This work was written perhaps in the Herodian age, or possibly after A.D. 70, in which case it cannot have influenced the Pauline Epistles.

5. The books 2 (4) Esdras (of the Apocrypha) and Baruch, written after A.D. 70, are valuable for the light they throw upon the mental and religious attitude of the Jews when faced with the destruction of the Holy City. These books make clear their determination still to cling to their ancestral religion although the Temple and all that it stood for had apparently tumbled about their ears. Baruch courageously appeals to the Palestinian Jews to remain in the land, and to those of the Dispersion to abide by the Law, in spite of this overwhelming disaster. "Zion hath been taken from us, and we have nothing now save the Almighty and His Law" (85<sup>3</sup>), but "if ye have respect unto the Law and are intent

upon wisdom, the lamp will not fail and the shepherd will not depart and the fountain will not run dry" (77<sup>16</sup>). 2 (4) Esdras is notable for the author's "arraignment of Providence," which, says Burkitt, has no parallel "either in Jewish or in Christian literature till we come to modern times."<sup>1</sup> In words of scathing remonstrance Esdras exclaims: "This is my first and last saying, that it had been better not to have given the earth unto Adam; or else, when it was given him, to have restrained him from sinning" (7<sup>46</sup>). A more particular aspect is also assumed by his complaint: "Thou gavest thy city over into the hands of thine enemies. Are their deeds then any better that inhabit Babylon, that they should therefore have the dominion over Sion?" (3<sup>27π</sup>).

Passing from such stray points as these, and from the more general aspect of the Pseudepigrapha, and viewing them from the more specific standpoint of the extent of their influence upon the NT Epistles, and the data from which this can be appraised, we shall probably best achieve our purpose by considering them *seriatim*, so as to ascertain the principal material afforded by each of them with respect to this important question.

(1) In the *General* Epistles various passages either in thought or expression reflect or illustrate passages in 1 Enoch. One of these is Jude<sup>4</sup>, which speaks of certain ungodly men as "denying our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ," and to which a close parallel is found in En 48<sup>10</sup>: "They have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed" (cf. 38<sup>2</sup>, 41<sup>2</sup>). If with Charles we assign the Parables in Enoch either to B.C. 94-79, or 70-64, the term "Anointed One" (=Messiah) must be regarded as occurring here for the first time in its technical sense of the true Messianic King. In the OT it is of wider application, being used of any one entrusted with some religious commission. Thus the Davidic

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 43.



king, the Jewish high-priest, the servant of Jahweh, and even the Persian Cyrus are each called "the Lord's Anointed." After actual kingship no longer existed in Jewry the idea still lived on, and, fostered by the synagogue worship, led the pious in view of the unsatisfactory experience of the past to "wait for the consolation of Israel" in the person of the perfect Messianic King. Other resemblances between 1 Enoch and Jude are Jude 6, "The angels who abandoned their own domain," En 12<sup>4</sup>, "The watchers who have left the high heaven"; Jude 13, "wandering stars," En 18<sup>15</sup>, "The stars which roll over the fire are they which have transgressed the commandment of the Lord because they did not come forth at their appointed time" (see also 21<sup>3.6</sup>); and Jude 14, "the seventh from Adam," a phrase found in En 60<sup>8</sup>. Further, Jude 14<sup>f</sup>. is a direct quotation, and specified as such, from En 1<sup>9</sup>, "Behold, the Lord comes with myriads of his holy ones, to execute judgement upon all, and to convict all the impious of all the impious deeds they have committed, and of all the harsh things said against him by impious sinners." Here "Enoch" is evidently viewed as inspired prophecy. The statement in 1 Peter regarding "the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient" recalls En 10<sup>4.13</sup>, "Bind Azāzel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness. . . . They (Semjāza and his associates) shall be led off to the torment and the prison in which they shall be confined for ever." The phrase "new heavens and a new earth" (2 Pet 3<sup>13</sup>) shews close affinity with En 45<sup>4</sup>, "I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light, and I will transform the earth and make it a blessing." Here, however, the association may well be with Is 65<sup>17</sup>, 66<sup>22</sup>, rather than with Enoch. Cf. Jub 1<sup>29</sup>. The Johannine contrast between light and darkness is frequently found in Enoch, and in particular the words "Walk in the light," 1 Jn 1<sup>7</sup>, are akin to those in En 92<sup>4</sup>, "he shall walk in eternal light." Additional

parallelisms in this epistle are 2<sup>1</sup>, "Jesus Christ the righteous," and En 53<sup>6</sup>, "the Righteous and Elect One"; 2<sup>8</sup>, "the darkness is past and the true light shineth," and En 58<sup>5</sup>, "It has become bright as the sun upon earth, and the darkness is past"; 2<sup>15</sup>, "Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world," and En 108<sup>8</sup>, "who love God, and loved neither gold nor silver nor any of the good things which are in the world." The symbol of a white bull for the Messiah, and the transformation of all belonging to the kingdom into his likeness may also have formed the groundwork for the statement in 1 Jn 3<sup>2</sup>, "We shall be like Him." Possibly also the denunciations of the rich in Ja 1<sup>10</sup>, 2<sup>2-6</sup>, 5<sup>1-6</sup>, have their prototype in certain passages of Enoch, such as 46<sup>7</sup>, "their power rests upon their riches," 63<sup>10</sup>, "our souls are full of unrighteous gain," 94<sup>8-11</sup>, "Woe to you, ye rich, for ye have trusted in your riches, and from your riches shall ye depart, because ye have not remembered the Most High in the days of your riches." Cf. also 96<sup>4-8</sup>.

(2) The influence of 1 Enoch is distinctly traceable in the *Pauline* Epistles. Indeed it is hardly too much to say that it furnished the mental background of the apostle, and thus exercised a formative influence on Christianity. From the subjoined list of passages it will be seen that the angelology of 1 Enoch, so clearly reflected in the Gospels, has left its impress likewise on the letters of Paul. It is also noteworthy that the efficacy of the Messiah's "name" is an idea expressed by the apocalyptic and reproduced by the apostle (e.g. in Ph 2<sup>9f.</sup>).<sup>1</sup>

The designation "angels of power and . . . angels of principalities," En 61<sup>10</sup>, finds an echo in Ro 8<sup>38</sup>, "Neither angels, nor principalities, nor powers," in Col 1<sup>16</sup>, "Principalities and powers," and in 2 Thess 1<sup>7</sup>, "the angels of His power." With En 39<sup>1</sup>, "elect and holy children . . . from the high heaven," corresponds "the elect angels," 1 Tim 5<sup>21</sup>; and the statement of En

<sup>1</sup> Note 7, see p. 389.

14<sup>21</sup> that "none of the angels could enter and could behold His face by reason of the magnificence and glory," suggests comparison with 1 Tim 6<sup>16</sup>, "dwelling in light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen." Further parallelisms are: En 77<sup>1</sup>, "He who is blessed for ever," and Ro 9<sup>5</sup>, 2 Co 11<sup>31</sup>, "God blessed for ever"; En 48<sup>7</sup>, "in His (the Messiah's) name they are saved," and 1 Co 6<sup>11</sup>, "Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus"; En 38<sup>4</sup>, "The Lord of Spirits has caused His light to appear on the face of the holy, righteous, and elect," and 2 Co 4<sup>6</sup>, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ"; En 48<sup>7</sup>, "this world of unrighteousness," and Gal 1<sup>4</sup>, "this present evil world"; En 48<sup>5</sup>, "shall fall down and worship before Him" (the Messiah), and Ph 2<sup>10</sup>, "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow"; En 46<sup>3</sup>, "the Son of man . . . who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden," and Col 2<sup>3</sup>, "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"; En 62<sup>4</sup>, "Then shall pain come upon them as on a woman in travail," and 1 Thess 5<sup>3</sup>, "Then sudden destruction cometh upon them as upon a woman with child"; En 93<sup>4</sup>, "a law shall be made for the sinners," and 1 Tim 1<sup>9</sup>, "Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly"; En 94<sup>1</sup>, "worthy of all acceptation," as in 1 Tim 1<sup>15</sup>; En 9<sup>4</sup>, "Lord of Lords . . . King of Kings," and 1 Tim 6<sup>15</sup>, "King of Kings and Lord of Lords."

The quotation in 1 Co 2<sup>9</sup>, prefixed by "as it is written," presents some difficulty since, except for some slight resemblance to Is 64<sup>4</sup>, the words do not occur in the OT. According to Origen and others, to the horror of Jerome, the citation is from the lost Apocalypse of Elias, but it is Paul's practice to quote in this way only from canonical Scriptures. Meyer's solution, which would also have been resented by Jerome, is that through a slip of memory he confused between the apocryphal saying and an intended canonical source.

(3) A few passages in *Hebrews* suggest acquaintance with 1 Enoch. Heb 4<sup>13</sup>, "All things are naked and laid open before the eyes of Him with whom we have to do," reflects En 9<sup>5</sup>, "All things are naked and open in Thy sight, and Thou seest all things, and nothing can hide itself from Thee." The statement in Heb 11<sup>5</sup>, "Enoch was translated . . . for before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God," appears to be a general reflexion of passages in 1 Enoch where Enoch is hailed as "a righteous man and scribe of righteousness," 12<sup>4</sup>, 15<sup>1</sup> (cf. 92<sup>1</sup>).<sup>1</sup> In the reference to the new Jerusalem in Heb 11<sup>10</sup> as "the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God," may perhaps be found an echo of En 90<sup>29</sup>, "The Lord of the sheep (*i.e.* God) brought a new house greater than the first . . . all its pillars were new," etc. The expression, "Father of spirits," Heb 12<sup>9</sup>, is parallel to "Lord of spirits," 37<sup>2</sup>.<sup>4</sup>, and many other passages in the Parables of 1 Enoch, while in Heb 12<sup>22</sup> "the heavenly Jerusalem" is akin to En 90<sup>29</sup>, already quoted.

Parallelisms in thought or diction between the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs and the NT Epistles are too numerous for detailed treatment here. For our purpose it may suffice if from the forty or fifty instances specified by Charles (*Introd.*, p. lxxxv. ff.) we note the following: 1 Thess 2<sup>16</sup>, "The wrath is come upon them to the uttermost," and Ro 1<sup>32</sup> (They) "not only do the same, but also consent with them that practise them," are direct quotations from T. Levi 6<sup>11</sup> and T. Asher 6<sup>2</sup> respectively. With Ro 9<sup>21</sup>, "Hath not the potter the right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" cf. T. Naph. 2<sup>3</sup>, "The potter knoweth the vessel, how

<sup>1</sup> In Sir 44<sup>16</sup> Enoch's having pleased God is given as the ground of his translation, although there he is presented as "an example of repentance to all generations," the implication being that at one time he had been a transgressor.

much it is to contain, and bringeth the clay accordingly"; with Ro 12<sup>1</sup>, "dedicate your bodies as a living sacrifice, consecrated and acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service," cf. T. Levi 3<sup>8</sup>, "offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and a bloodless offering"; and with Ro 12<sup>21</sup>, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," cf. T. Benj. 4<sup>3</sup>, "By doing good he overcometh evil." The expression "God of peace," Ro 15<sup>33</sup>, 1 Thess 5<sup>23</sup>, Ph 4<sup>9</sup>, may be an echo of T. Dan 5<sup>2</sup>. It has been suggested that 1 Co 4<sup>4</sup>, "I know nothing against myself, yet am I not hereby justified," may be pointed at Issachar's self-satisfied declaration, "I am not conscious of committing any sin," T. Iss. 7<sup>1</sup> (cf. T. Zeb. 1<sup>4</sup>). The apostle's panegyric upon love as "taking no account of evil," 1 Co 13, may have been inspired by T. Zeb. 8<sup>5</sup>, "Love one another; and do not set down in account, each one of you, evil against his brother." There is a close parallel between 2 Co 6<sup>14f.</sup>, "What communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?" and T. Levi 19<sup>1</sup>, "Choose therefore for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Belial." Paul's designation of Christians as "lights in the world," Ph 2<sup>15</sup>, is a striking development of the Jewish conception of Levi's posterity as "the lights of Israel," T. Levi 19<sup>3</sup>. T. Jud. 19<sup>3</sup>, "had mercy on me, because I did it in ignorance," is reflected in 1 Tim 1<sup>13</sup>, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." The title "mediator between God and man," used in T. Dan 6<sup>2</sup> of the archangel Michael, is in 1 Tim 2<sup>5</sup> given by Paul to Christ. "Crown of righteousness," 2 Tim 4<sup>8</sup>, occurs in T. Levi 8<sup>2</sup>. Ja 3<sup>10</sup>, "Out of the same mouth cometh both blessing and cursing," is closely parallel to T. Benj. 6<sup>5</sup>, "The good mind hath not two tongues, of blessing and of cursing," and Ja 4<sup>7</sup>, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you" to T. Naph. 8<sup>4</sup>, "If ye work that which is good . . . the devil shall flee from

you." 2 Pet 2<sup>4</sup>, "reserved unto judgement," and Jude 6, "kept in everlasting bonds . . . unto the judgement of the great day," correspond to T. Reub. 5<sup>5</sup>, "reserved for eternal punishment."

From the cumulative impression produced by these various parallelisms it may reasonably be inferred that the Greek translation of the Testaments was well known to Paul, even if a definite literary connexion cannot be confidently asserted. According, however, to Kautzsch,<sup>1</sup> its relation to the NT cannot be clearly stated until the question as to its sources has been settled. In order to this two things are necessary—first, the exact determination of the frontier line between what is Jewish and what is specifically Christian, and secondly, a decision as to whether, apart from the Christian additions, the Testaments are a unity or, as Kautzsch maintains, a combination of two originally distinct Jewish sources.

Points of contact with the Book of Jubilees are traceable in the NT Epistles, and if Charles is right in assigning the date of Jubilees to the reign of Hyrcanus (B.C. 135–105), then Jubilees must be held to have influenced the NT writings, instead of *vice versa*, as has commonly been supposed. From this point of view there is in Jub 33<sup>15f.</sup> an anticipation of the Pauline position that "where there is no law, neither is there transgression," Ro 4<sup>15</sup>. The expression, "a new and righteous nature," Jub 5<sup>12</sup>, is analogous to that of "a new creation," Gal 6<sup>15</sup>, "Sinners of the Gentiles" occurs both in Jub 23<sup>24</sup> and in Gal 2<sup>15</sup>. The covenant with Abraham, Jub 15<sup>4ff.</sup>, and the covenant "confirmed beforehand by God," Gal 3<sup>17</sup>, probably both point to the birth of Isaac four hundred and thirty years before the Sinaitic legislation. "Sons of perdition," Jub 10<sup>3</sup>, corresponds to "son of perdition," 2 Thess 2<sup>3</sup>. What is said of "fables and endless genealogies," 1 Tim 1<sup>4</sup>, "old wives' fables," 1 Tim 4<sup>7</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* ii. p. 460.

and "genealogies and strifes and fightings about the law," Tit 3<sup>9</sup>, may well refer to what is a prominent feature of Jubilees. The repudiation in Ja 1<sup>13</sup> of attributing temptation to God is in line with the representation in Jubilees of the prince of Mastêmâ as instigating the temptation of Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, 17<sup>18</sup>, hardening the hearts of the Egyptians, and prompting their pursuit of Israel, 48<sup>12</sup>. 17. The words of Jub. 14<sup>6</sup>, "He believed on the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness," and of 19<sup>9</sup>, "he was found faithful, and was recorded on the heavenly tables as the friend of God," are almost identical with Ja 2<sup>23</sup>. In 2 Pet 2<sup>5</sup> Noah is designated "a preacher of righteousness"; Jub 7<sup>26-39</sup> gives what purports to be his sermon. The statement of Jub 12<sup>9</sup>, "The heavens and the earth shall be renewed," corresponds to 2 Pet 3<sup>13</sup>, "new heavens and a new earth" (cf. 1 En 45<sup>4</sup>, and Is 65<sup>17</sup>, 66<sup>22</sup>). Finally, the declaration of Jub 4<sup>30</sup>, "one thousand years are as one day in the testimony of the heavens," is repeated in 2 Pet 3<sup>8</sup>, "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years."

Another apocalyptic writing which calls for consideration is the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, written perhaps about the beginning of the Christian era, although the date is uncertain. In the ancient world there was a widespread belief in the plurality of the heavens. It was shared by Babylonians, Zoroastrians, Greeks, and post-exilic Israelites. On the seven-fold division of the planets was based the theory of a similar division applicable to earth and hell,<sup>1</sup> and thus inevitably also to the heavens as the planetary orbit. Among Jewish apocalyptic books, besides a rather colourless account in the Ascension of Isaiah, the conception of seven heavens finds frequent expression in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, and in Slavonic Enoch. The account in the latter (3-20) is too elaborate to enter

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Babylonian Religion*, p. 221 ff.

upon in detail. It has, however, to be noted that in this work the idea of the existence of evil in heaven finds repeated expression,<sup>1</sup> and that hell is located in the north of the third heaven. Although to present-day conceptions it seems incongruous to allot a place in heaven to evil-doers, it did not appear so to the Jews and primitive Christians. Satan could present himself in heaven, Job 1<sup>7</sup>, and Eph 6<sup>12</sup> speaks of "the spirits (=forces) of evil in the heavenly sphere."<sup>2</sup> In the latter passage the reference is probably to the forces of Satan, the prince of the air (Eph 2<sup>2</sup>), rather than to the fallen angels in the second heaven. On the other hand, "the things in the heavens" spoken of in Col 1<sup>20</sup> as needing to be reconciled to God, seem to point not to the redemption of the Satanic powers, but to the fallen angels imprisoned in the second heaven (cf. 1 Pet 3<sup>19</sup>, "the spirits in prison"), as may also "the angelic rulers and authorities in the heavenly sphere" (Eph 3<sup>10</sup>), though Charles considers it more likely that they are the rulers of the various lower heavens mentioned in Eph 4<sup>10</sup>: "he that ascended above all the heavens." That Paul believed in plurality of heavens is, however, not only suggested by parallels in his epistles to apocalyptic literature, but is clear from his own statement in 2 Co 12<sup>2f.</sup>: "I know a man in Christ, who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven . . . this man was caught up to paradise." The placing of paradise in the third heaven is in accord with the representation in Slavonic Enoch, and taken along with the allocation of evil to the heavens, Eph 6<sup>12</sup>, affords corroborative proof that (if the writer) the apostle, too, held to the doctrine of seven heavens. At the same time, it has to be recognized that he often makes use of the singular *ὁ πᾶν*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. sections on the second, third, and fifth heavens, and also T. Levi 3, T. Isaac 146 f.

<sup>2</sup> The notion ultimately disappeared alike from Jewish and Christian circles.



(Ro 1<sup>18</sup>, 10<sup>6</sup>; 1 Co 8<sup>5</sup>, 15<sup>47</sup>; Gal 1<sup>8</sup>, etc.). In the Epistle to the Hebrews also reference is made to the heavens through which Christ ascended to a position higher than them all. Ch. 4<sup>14</sup> describes Him as "a great high-priest who hath passed through the heavens," and in 7<sup>26</sup> He is declared to have been "lifted high above the heavens." Here again the idea of seven heavens appears to underlie the language of the sacred writer.

Some further resemblances fall to be noted between the Pauline Epistles and Slavonic Enoch. With 42<sup>12</sup>, "Blessed is he in whom is the truth, that he may speak the truth to his neighbour," cf. Eph 4<sup>25</sup>, "Let each tell his neighbour the truth"; with 20<sup>1</sup>, "Lordships and principalities and powers," cf. Col 1<sup>16</sup>, "Dominions or principalities or powers"; with 66<sup>1</sup>, "Walk before his face with fear and trembling," cf. Ph 2<sup>12</sup>, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Again, we meet with two parallels in 2 Pet. With 7<sup>1</sup>, "The darkness and . . . the prisoners . . . reserved for . . . judgement," cf. 2 Pet 2<sup>4</sup>, "God did not spare angels who had sinned, but committing them to pits of the nether gloom in Tartarus, reserved them under punishment for doom"; and with 47<sup>4</sup>, "made firm the earth upon the waters," cf. 2 Pet 3<sup>5</sup>, "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water." Finally, another parallel occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews. With 25<sup>1</sup>, "I commanded . . . that visible things should come out of invisible," and with 24<sup>2</sup>, "I will tell thee . . . what things I created from the non-existent, and what things visible from the invisible," cf. Heb 11<sup>3</sup>, "The world was fashioned by the word of God, and thus the visible was made out of the invisible." This book, it may again be noted, says nothing about a Messiah or the nearness of the End. Its practical outlook on the world is different from that of Jewish Apocalypse generally.

The Assumption of Moses,<sup>1</sup> a Palestinian Semitic work, probably dating from about A.D. 6,<sup>2</sup> was known to St. Jude. Clement, Origen, and other ancient writers refer to it as the source of the story regarding the contest between the archangel Michael and Satan for the body of Moses, narrated in v. 9 of his epistle. Piecing together the statements of extant fragments, Charles would reconstruct the account contained in the original Assumption as follows: "(1) Michael is commissioned to bury Moses. (2) Satan opposes his burial on two grounds—(a) He claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins, 'The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's Spirit that created the world and all mankind' (hence not Satan but God was the Lord of matter). (b) Satan brings the charge of murder against Moses (the answer to this charge is wanting). . . . Finally, all opposition having been overcome, the Assumption takes place in the presence of Joshua and Caleb. . . . Moses 'living in the spirit' is carried up to heaven, the dead body of Moses is buried in the recesses of the mountains." The story rests upon Dt 34<sup>6</sup>: "He buried him (R.V. *marg.*, he was buried) in the valley . . . but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." 2 Pet 2<sup>10f.</sup>, if not founded on Jude <sup>9</sup>, seems also to depend on the original Assumption. The latter supposition is strengthened by the resemblance of another passage, 2 Pet 2<sup>13</sup>, "they that count it pleasure to riot in the daytime," to 7<sup>5</sup> of the Assumption, "omni hora diei amantes convivia."

Certain parallelisms occur between passages in the Epistles and the Apocalypse of Baruch. With Ro 2<sup>14f.</sup>, "When the Gentiles who have not the law, do by nature

<sup>1</sup> Charles thinks that the Latin fragment or so-called Assumption of Moses was really the *Testament of Moses*, to which the editor intended to make the *Assumption of Moses* a sequel.

<sup>2</sup> "Soon after the deposition of Archelaus" (Burkitt).

the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; who shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing, one another," may be compared Bar 48<sup>40</sup>, "Because each of the inhabitants of the earth knew when he was committing iniquity, and they have not known my law by reason of their pride." Ro 8<sup>18</sup> (2 Co 4<sup>17</sup>), "The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us," is nearly parallel to Bar 15<sup>8</sup>, "This world is to them a trouble and a weariness . . . and that which is to come a crown with great glory." 1 Co 4<sup>5</sup>, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts," affords a parallel to Bar 83<sup>3</sup>, "He will assuredly examine the secret thoughts, and that which is laid up in the secret chambers of all the members of men, and will make (them) manifest in the presence of all with reproof." 1 Co 15<sup>19</sup> seems to equate with Bar 21<sup>13</sup>: "If this were the only life which men have, nothing could be more miserable." With 2 Pet 2<sup>4</sup> and Jude 6 may be compared the statement in Bar 56<sup>13</sup> regarding the tormenting in chains of the fallen angels. The expression in 2 Pet 3<sup>13</sup>, "new heavens and a new earth" is akin to that of Bar 32<sup>6</sup>, "The mighty One will renew His creation" (cf. 1 En 45<sup>4</sup>, Jub 1<sup>29</sup>, Is 65<sup>17</sup>, 66<sup>22</sup>). As, however, our Apocalypse is of composite authorship, and written at different dates during the half-century A.D. 50-100, it is impossible to know whether the related passages in the NT which date from the same period are dependent on it, or *vice versa*. This book, however, as Charles remarks, is of very great value to the NT student, as it furnishes him with the historical setting and background of many of the NT problems. Doctrinally, both on the question of original

sin and on that of faith and works in relation to salvation, it is distinctly anti-Pauline. It affirms, however, the resurrection of the body. The apostle took over some Jewish elements into his religious creed, but only in a purified and Christianized form. Indeed, "the measure of the difference between the Apocalypse of Baruch and the Epistles of Paul is the measure of the influence of the Christian religion."<sup>1</sup>

Of parallels or coincidences between 2 (4) Esdras and the NT Epistles the following may be specified: 3<sup>7</sup>, "Unto him (Adam) thou gavest commandment to love thy way: which he transgressed, and immediately thou appointedst death in him and in his generations" with 1 Co 15<sup>22</sup>, "In Adam all die"; 4<sup>24</sup>, 14<sup>34</sup>, "obtain mercy," with 1 Tim 1<sup>16</sup>; 5<sup>40</sup>, "even so canst thou not find out my judgement," with Ro 11<sup>33</sup>, 7<sup>32f</sup>, "The earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgement; and 14<sup>35</sup>, "After death shall the judgement come, when we shall live again," with 1 Co 15<sup>21</sup>, "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead," and 2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>, 2 Tim 4<sup>1</sup>, Jude 14<sup>f</sup>.; 8<sup>32</sup>, "works of righteousness," with Tit 3<sup>5</sup>; 8<sup>35</sup>, "There is no man but hath dealt wickedly," with Ro 3<sup>23</sup>; 8<sup>46</sup>, "things present and things to come," with Ro 8<sup>38</sup>; 9<sup>11</sup>, "place of repentance," with Heb 12<sup>17</sup>; 10<sup>50</sup>, "the brightness of her glory," with Heb 1<sup>3</sup>; 12<sup>47</sup>, "the Mighty hath not forgotten you in temptation," with 1 Co 10<sup>13</sup>, "God . . . will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able"; 16<sup>53</sup>, "coals of fire upon his head," with Ro 12<sup>20</sup>. This last forms part of a later addition by a Christian hand.

If Dillmann, Reuss, and Schürer are correct in assigning 2 (4) Esdras to the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96), the Pauline Epistles, probably dating from A.D. 53-66, were all written before it, so that in the matter of parallel-

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, *The Apocryphal Books*, p. 84.

isms Esdras must be regarded as dependent on the Epistles, and not *vice versa*. The same thing applies to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is most reasonably assigned to the year 66 or 67. In any case, it may be noted that in the statement of 2 (4) Esdr 7<sup>50</sup>, "The Most High hath not made one age, but two," striking expression is given to the essential difference between the Hellenistic civilization and the Hebrew nationalism that so fiercely resisted it. The doctrine of the two æons forms the real substructure of all the apocalyptic books.

We have next to inquire whether there are in the NT Epistles traces of resemblance to the text of the Ascension of Isaiah. The language of Heb 11<sup>37</sup> suggests that the writer was probably acquainted with the legend of the Martyrdom of Isaiah contained in the Ascension.<sup>1</sup> Frequently as "the several heavens," 7<sup>37</sup>, and "all the heavens," 11<sup>31</sup>, are spoken of, it is noteworthy that, in contrast to the idea of the Seven Heavens common to Judaism and early Christianity, the evil powers are confined to the firmament below the first heaven, and the lower heavens are partly segregated from the sixth and seventh (10<sup>24</sup>). The doctrine of the resurrection is expressed conformally to the representation in the Pauline Epistles (4<sup>15-17</sup>, 8<sup>14</sup>, 9<sup>17f.</sup>). As in 2 Co 5<sup>8</sup>, the faithful are at their death clothed in their "garments," or spiritual bodies, but the further statement that they do not receive their "thrones and crowns" till the descent of Christ to the world and His subsequent ascent to the seventh heaven (9<sup>11-13</sup>. 17f.) has no counterpart in the teaching of the apostle.

In the Ascension (1<sup>8f.</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>11</sup>, etc.) as well as in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (e.g. Reuben 2, 4, 6,

<sup>1</sup> If written after A.D. 70, this apocryphal work cannot have influenced the NT Epistles; but it is evidently of a composite character, partly Jewish and partly Christian, the martyrdom being of Jewish and the vision of Christian origin.

Dan 5, Levi 3) frequent mention is made of Beliar,<sup>1</sup> also named Berial, Belchâr (Jub 1<sup>20</sup>, in some MSS.), and equivalent in some respects to Sammael, the special enemy of Israel, and to the archdemon Satan or the devil. The word signifies *wickedness*, and is not used as a proper name in the OT. For the meaning cf. Judg 19<sup>22</sup>, where "sons of Belial" is aptly rendered "vile scoundrels" by G. F. Moore. Bousset regards "the man of lawlessness" or "the man of sin" in 2 Thess 2<sup>3</sup> as perhaps a translation of Belial. The latter is probably a correction of the form Beliar, *l* and *r* being often interchanged in the vernacular of Hellenistic Jews. The name occurs as a synonym for Satan in 2 Co 6<sup>15</sup>, where Paul declares that there is no concord between Christ (as light) and Belial (as darkness). A partial analogy to the description of the "prince of this world" as dwelling in the firmament (Asc 10<sup>29</sup>) occurs in Eph 2<sup>2</sup>, which speaks of "the sway of the prince of the air." Latterly, under the name of Beliar, the Emperor Nero (*redivivus*) was mythically invested with the character, and conceived as the leader of the armies, of the Antichrist. In the NT the name Antichrist is found only in the Johannine Epistles (1 Jn 2<sup>18ff.</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>; 2 Jn 7). The idea had received earlier expression, however, in Dan 11<sup>36</sup>, "he (*i.e.* Antiochus Epiphanes) shall exalt himself above the God of gods," and in 2 Thess 2<sup>4</sup>, "he that opposeth himself . . . against all that is called God." Until its fusion with that of Beliar, which came to be identified with the superhuman Antichrist, this idea connoted only "a God-opposing being of human origin."

In the Sibylline Oracles we meet with a different type of apocalyptic literature. They are modelled upon the pronouncements of the ancient Sibyl (or Sibylls) and deal under the veil of prophecy with the fate of nations, cities, islands, temples, etc., and constitute a form of Jewish propaganda "under a heathen mask." In these writings,

<sup>1</sup> Note 5. See p. 388.

of which twelve books and some fragments are extant in Greek, things past, present, and future are often jumbled together. They are the product of various writers, some of whom lived centuries before others. The bulk of the oracles are Jewish, with certain Christian interpolations. Book 7 is the work of a Judaizing Christian, and others are also of Christian origin. The oldest section is Book 3, and probably belongs to the Maccabaeian age. It forms a miscellany of ancient matter—Babylonian, Greek, and Jewish, with some later Christian additions. Towards the close the Sibyl introduces the Warrior-Messiah, who makes war to cease, 653 ff. Books 4 and 5 date for the most part from the latter part of the first century A.D., and are somewhat more intelligible than the confused medley of Book 3. The apocalyptic element is fuller in 5 than in 4. Books 6–8 are largely of Christian origin: in parts use is made of the Gospels and the Johannine Apocalypse.

In Books 3–5 (cf. 2 Thess 2<sup>3-12</sup>) Belial, the legendary Nero, is possibly referred to in 3<sup>63</sup>, and more clearly in 4<sup>117-124, 137-139</sup>, and in 5<sup>27-34</sup>, etc. According to 4<sup>119f. 138ff.</sup>, he did not die, but fled from Rome to the East, beyond the Euphrates. In Book 5 he is represented as the slayer of his mother (363), and as divinely empowered to bring in a reign of terror (214–227), “in the time of the end” (361).

With 3<sup>85ff.</sup>, which describe the destruction of the world by fire, cf. 2 Pet 3<sup>10</sup>; with 3<sup>591</sup>, “They lift up to heaven holy hands,” cf. 1 Tim 2<sup>8</sup>; with 3<sup>601ff.</sup>, which refer to unnatural vice, idolatry, and the retribution thereby incurred, cf. Ro 1<sup>24ff.</sup>. With 4<sup>41ff.</sup>, which affirms the judgement of “the godly and ungodly alike,” cf. 2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>. With 4<sup>152ff.</sup>, which speak of the “perishing of the faith of godliness among men,” cf. 2 Thess 2<sup>3</sup>, 2 Tim 3<sup>1ff.</sup>, and Jude 18. With 4<sup>161f.</sup>, “He will destroy the whole race of man at once with a great burning,” cf. 2 Pet 3<sup>6f.</sup>. With 4<sup>174</sup> and 4<sup>132f.</sup>, “A great sign of a sword

with a trumpet," " God shall clothe the bones again in human shape, and remake men as they were before," cf. 1 Co 15<sup>52</sup>, and 1 Thess 4<sup>16</sup>. The phrase " endure hardness," 5<sup>270</sup>, occurs in 2 Tim 2<sup>3</sup>.

Some passages of the Psalms of Solomon <sup>1</sup> appear to be reflected in the Epistles of the NT. Thus 2<sup>16</sup>, " Thou dost reward sinful men according to their deeds," and 17<sup>8</sup>, " According to their sins thou wilt reward them, O God : and it shall befall them according to their works," are closely parallel to Ro 2<sup>8</sup>, " who will render to every man according to his deeds," to 2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>, " We must all be made manifest before the judgement-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad "; and to 2 Tim 4<sup>14</sup>, " The Lord will render to him according to his works." With 2<sup>18</sup>, " God is a judge and righteous, and accepts no man's person," cf. Ro 2<sup>11</sup>, " There is no respect of persons with God," and similar language in Gal 2<sup>6</sup>, 2 Tim 4<sup>8</sup>, and 1 Pet 1<sup>17</sup>. A recurrence of the expression, " God their Saviour," in 3<sup>6</sup>, meets us in Tit 2<sup>10</sup>, " God our Saviour." In spite of the writer's narrow Pharisaism and detestation of " the pollutions of the filthy Gentiles," 17<sup>30</sup>, the words of 6<sup>11</sup>, " Blessed is the man whose heart is prepared to call upon the name of the Lord : and when he shall remember the name of the Lord, he will be saved," shew some approximation to Ro 10<sup>13</sup>, " Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved "; 9<sup>4</sup>, " We work by freewill and the choice of our own souls to do either good or evil by the work of our hands," is analogous to the doctrine contained, *e.g.* in Ro 6<sup>171</sup>, " Whereas ye were servants of sin . . . ye became servants of righteousness," and in 2 Tim 2<sup>19</sup>, " Let every one who names the name of the Lord give up evil," Col 1<sup>12</sup>, " The Father made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," is perhaps reminiscent of

<sup>1</sup> Note 6. See p. 388.



Ps of Sol 12<sup>6</sup>, "The saints of the Lord shall inherit the promises of the Lord." In Heb 4<sup>13</sup>, "There is no creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do," is virtually an expansion of Ps of Sol 18<sup>2</sup>, "Thine eyes behold everything, and there is nothing hid from them." From these Biblical coincidences or allusions, however, it must not with Charles be inferred that the Ps of Sol are of "a Christian character," or with Graetz that "their Christian character is unequivocal." This hypothesis is based merely on the Messianic passages (17 and 18<sup>8</sup>), but "the Messiah is nothing higher than a 'son of David' (17<sup>21</sup>), and there is not the faintest trace of any acquaintance with the facts of Christian history." <sup>1</sup>

A survey that should include the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Revelation would provide still more conclusive evidence of the influence of Jewish apocalyptic literature upon the NT, and would reveal real literary connexion, especially with 1 Enoch; but even from our more limited point of view, Biblical coincidences and semi-quotations shew that the writers of the NT Epistles were not only acquainted with these writings, but were to some extent at least indebted to them alike in matter and in form.

The theological trend of Jewish Apocalyptic and its influence on the NT in general having been dealt with in a previous work by the present writer,<sup>2</sup> to enter here on a fresh discussion of these topics seems superfluous. What in this connexion bears on the Epistles has been practically included in the larger survey. A brief indication of the main points resulting from the foregoing comparisons between the language of the Apocalypses and the NT Epistles may, however, fitly conclude this section of our theme. Strictly speaking, perhaps, this should form part of the *doctrinal* background, but it

<sup>1</sup> Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *The Background of the Gospels*, ch. vii.

seems most convenient to include it here. Within this limited scope, then, and analytically considered, what does the apocalyptic influence amount to?

For one thing the sharp distinction between the present and the future age, this world and the world to come, is clearly reflected in the Pauline "things present and things to come" (Ro 8<sup>38</sup>), "things seen and temporal and things not seen and eternal" (2 Co 4<sup>18</sup>). By means of this basic distinction religious interest is transferred from the present to the future, and the actual set in contrast to the ideal. According to the apocalyptic writers, the present age is essentially evil, and cannot be transformed into a kingdom of God. This represents a marked divergence from the national hope and world-view of the prophets, and is perhaps traceable to Persian influence, or partly even to Hellenistic paganism, characterized as it was by an ingrained pessimism and belief in the agency of evil spirits.

If in a lesser degree than the Synoptic Gospels, the NT Epistles also reflect the developed angelology, demonology, and eschatology of the apocalyptic writings.<sup>1</sup> Numerous passages make mention of angelic beings in general,<sup>2</sup> while elect angels are referred to in 1 Tim 5<sup>21</sup>, and fallen angels in 2 Pet 2<sup>4</sup> and Jude 6. Conceiving of God as dwelling in the remote heavens, and existing transcendently apart from His creatures, the apocalypticists postulate a hierarchy of angelic intermediaries between Him and His people, with a view to the carrying out of His decrees. In active hostility to these is the formidable host of the demonic hierarchy with Satan at its head. Agreeably to the conception of the two æons, Paul speaks of Satan as "the god of this present age" (2 Co 4<sup>4</sup>), and the prince of the demonic powers (Ro 8<sup>38</sup>; Col 1<sup>16</sup>) together with elemental and astral spirits—*στοιχεῖα*—(Gal 4<sup>9</sup> and Col 2<sup>8</sup>), as antagonists of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> On the question of Persian influence here, see *infra*, p. 287 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ro 8<sup>38</sup>; 1 Co 6<sup>3</sup>; Gal 3<sup>19</sup>, 4<sup>14</sup>; Col 2<sup>18</sup>; Heb 1<sup>4ff.</sup>, etc.

kingdom. The dualism of the apocalyptic books has thus been carried over into the NT letters. In the apocalypses the origin of evil is connected with the fall of the angels recorded in Gn 6<sup>1-4</sup>. They are represented as led by Azāzel, and are symbolized by disobedient stars imprisoned under the earth and reserved for eternal torment. This development in demonology is mirrored in 2 Thess 1<sup>7ff.</sup> and in Jude <sup>6</sup>. Gradually there was evolved the idea of a personal devil, "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph 2<sup>2</sup>). In Ac 26<sup>18</sup> Paul declares unbelieving Gentiles to be under the power of Satan, who, from being merely as in the OT an accusing angel in the service of Jahweh, is conceived as "the devil."

Closely related to the notion of evil spirits and their antagonism to the righteous is the pessimistic outlook of Jewish apocalypse. It pictures the world as virtually the football of the demonic powers led by Satan. These persistently obstruct the divine will, foster idolatry, hound on the persecutors of the saints, and involve them in disease and disaster. To their malignant agency Paul ascribes his inability to visit the Thessalonians (1 Thess 2<sup>18</sup>), and the handicap of his thorn in the flesh (2 Co 12<sup>7</sup>). In the inscrutable providence of God they are permitted to lord it over the world, but in bringing about the crucifixion of the Lord of glory they overshot their mark and unintentionally fulfilled the divine purpose to their own downfall (1 Co 2<sup>6</sup>). Common, then, to both pagan and apocalyptic writers was the conception of demonic beings from whose tyranny men longed to be delivered, and the Christ-redemption proclaimed by Paul was in the first instance presented as a deliverance from the evil activities of these demonic powers. In this respect the apostle's outlook was akin to that of the apocalyptists. Like them he anticipated the glorious deliverance of the last days through the advent of the Messiah and his angels:

"Now is Salvation nearer to us than when we first believed. It is far on in the night, the day is almost here" (Ro 13<sup>11f.</sup>). Christ will overcome and deliver from the thralldom of these world-powers, including the man of sin whom he shall slay with the breath of his mouth (2 Thess 2<sup>8</sup>). This is a victory on which the believer can securely rely. "For I am certain neither death nor life, neither angels nor principalities, neither the present nor the future, no powers of the height or of the depth, nor anything else in all creation will be able to part us from God's love in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Ro 8<sup>38f.</sup>).

In one important particular, namely, with reference to the Messianic redemption, Paul thus introduces a striking deviation from the standpoint of Jewish apocalyptists. For the most part, the Messiah is either absent altogether from the apocalyptic books, or as in 2 (4) Esdras and 2 Baruch consigned to the background, or else changed into the translucent figure presented in the Similitudes of Enoch. Singularly enough, the designation "Son of Man," though almost certainly taken over from the apocalyptic books, has no place in the NT Epistles. And whereas most apocalyptists know of no redemption save that of the last days, Paul proclaims another and more wonderful redemption wrought through the advent of the Son of God, who by His death destroys the power of the devil and his hosts. Thereby the apocalyptic programme is materially modified, and the distinction between the old age and the new to a large extent obliterated, the new age having already been inaugurated by the resurrection of Christ. Men's eyes were thus turned to the redemption effected on the Cross rather than to that of the last day.

The doctrine of the Resurrection, although with varying conceptions regarding its extent, nature, and time,<sup>1</sup> was first clearly formulated in Daniel and other apocalyptic writings, and by the second century B.C. was

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 285 f.

closely connected with that of a world judgement of individuals at the change of æons. In the NT Epistles both the resurrection and the final judgement are definitely presented as facts of the Christian gospel.

To conclude : the expectation of the nearness of the end which characterizes the NT Epistles (Ro 13<sup>11f.</sup> ; 1 Co 7<sup>29ff.</sup> ; Ph 4<sup>5</sup>) as well as the Gospels, must be regarded as a legacy from the apocalyptic books. In his recent work, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, Schweitzer maintains that it is only in the light of this ruling conception that the Pauline doctrines of redemption and the sacraments can be truly interpreted.

## CHAPTER III

### THE GREEK ELEMENT

A THIRD factor in the literary background of the NT Epistles is that of Greek culture.

Even though in the NT quotations from Greek writers are comparatively few, the influence of Hellenic thought is clearly traceable. Of distinct and definite quotations there are only three or four. One of these occurs in Ac 17<sup>28</sup>, in Paul's speech at Athens, where, in affirming the nearness of God to humanity, he says, "It is in Him that we live and move and exist"—as some of your own poets have said, "We, too, belong to His race." The reference is to Aratus of Soli (B.C. 270, *Phaenom.* 5), or to Cleanthes of Soli (B.C. 300, *Hymn to Zeus*, 5), the words being used by both poets. It is possible that they had attained general currency in popular speech, but there seems no reason to doubt that one who could quote so pertinently from the poets as in the present instance could have done so more frequently had it suited his purpose. The other quotations are found in the Epistles. The words of 1 Co 15<sup>33</sup>, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," form in Greek an Iambic trimeter, and occur in the Thais of Menander, but the Apostle, and Alexander too, may have used them simply as a current proverbial saying. Certainly there is no indication that he is here quoting directly from another. It is otherwise, however, with the two remaining passages. The first is Tit 1<sup>12</sup>: "It has been said by one of themselves, by a prophet of their own, that Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons." Epimenides, a poet priest to whom the

Cretans sacrificed as a god, was the prophet in question. The first part of the hexameter verse quoted by Paul, "Cretans are always liars," is cited also by Callimachus in his *Hymn to Zeus*. Of this estimate of the Cretan character the accuracy is borne out by the testimony of Polybius, vi. 47: "You will hardly find anywhere characters more tricky and deceitful than those of the Cretans." In the second half of 2 Pet 2<sup>22</sup> occurs the other quotation, which runs thus: "The sow when washed will wallow in the mire." This seems to be a free version of a proverbial saying of Heraclitus.<sup>1</sup> As the first of the two proverbs in this verse is found in Pr 26<sup>11</sup>, Bigg suggests that the second was probably added by some Jewish paraphrast to the canonical collection of the Proverbs of Solomon. Another conjecture is that of Rendel Harris (*Story of Aḥikar*, p. lxvii.), who is of opinion that the source of the proverb may be traceable to the story of Aḥikar, in which are found these words: "My son, thou hast behaved like the swine which went to the bath with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it." Some consider that still another quotation from a Greek source occurs in 1 Co 15<sup>35</sup>: "But some one will ask, 'How do the dead rise? What kind of body have they when they come?'" This, however, is rather a precise formulation by the apostle of the objections put forward by deniers of the resurrection than a definite quotation from any particular sceptic who can be named.

Although from the paucity of quotations directly derived from Greek writers it might be presumed that Hellenic influence upon the NT Epistles was comparatively slight, evidence is not wanting to show the fallacy of such a conclusion. The question is not merely one of building up a theory of Greek influence on the slender foundation of two or three isolated passages.

<sup>1</sup> See Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 50.

Due allowance must be made for the many indisputable indications of the impact of Greek culture upon the authors of the epistolary writings apart from specific citations from Greek writers. Paul freely used Hellenistic categories of thought, and in his letters numerous coincidences of language suggest his familiarity with Platonic and Stoic ideas. The Epistle to the Hebrews also shews indubitable traces of Hellenistic modes of thought and expression. Very noticeable, for instance, is the writer's adherence to the Platonic conception of earthly things as but the temporary shadow of the eternal unseen reality. Hellenistic influence is also apparent in 2 Pet 3<sup>7</sup>. <sup>10ff.</sup>, which declares that the world will be destroyed by fire at the day of judgement. All this is not, however, to say that the influence of Hellenism on primitive Christianity either vitally affected the substance of the faith or detracted from the essential independence of Christianity as an original and fresh revelation of religious truth. Paul distinctly declares that while "the Greeks want wisdom," "our message is Christ the crucified," and if the writer to the Hebrews adopts the idea of the Platonic and Philonic Logos it is only to identify the Logos with the historical Jesus who saves His people from their sins, and to present Him as the author and perfecter of faith who inspires them with zeal in running the race set before them, and as the risen Lord, who, seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high, furnishes them with a pattern of stainless living.



## CHAPTER IV

### THE ROMAN ELEMENT

THE Roman element in the Epistles, and indeed in the NT as a whole, is historical rather than literary. While there are no quotations from Latin writers, there are various allusions to Roman dominion. The Gospels contain several references to Cæsar, in particular to Cæsar Augustus (Lk 2<sup>1</sup>) and to Tiberius Cæsar (Lk 3<sup>1</sup>). In the Acts mention is made of Claudius Cæsar (11<sup>28</sup>) and prominence is given to Paul's appeal to Cæsar (25<sup>11</sup>, etc.). "Strangers of Rome" figure in the list of visitors to Jerusalem at Pentecost (2<sup>10</sup>). The expulsion by Claudius of all Jews from the imperial city (18<sup>2</sup>), and Paul's desire to see it (19<sup>21</sup>) and his destination to bear witness there (23<sup>11</sup>) are noted, as is also the fact that on his arrival in the capital he "dwelt by himself," with a soldier for his keeper (28<sup>16</sup>). References in the Epistles are comparatively rare. Speaking of "the beloved of God in Rome" (Ro 1<sup>7</sup>), Paul declares his readiness to preach the gospel to them (Ro 1<sup>15</sup>). He refers with high appreciation to a friendly visit paid to him after diligent search by Onesiphorus, who had previously shewn him oft-repeated kindness at Ephesus (2 Tim 1<sup>16f.</sup>), and sends salutations to his household together with Prisca and Aquila (2 Tim 4<sup>19</sup>). In writing to the Philippians Paul also sends them greetings from "them of Cæsar's household" (4<sup>22</sup>). As the *domus Cæsaris* included all persons in the emperor's service, these members of the royal household might represent the chief officials as well as the humblest servitors. Their names for the most part point to a Greek origin, and

they were probably converts of an earlier date than that of Paul's arrival in Rome. From a special investigation of the names, Bishop Lightfoot concludes that the allusions in the Roman Epistle (chap. 16) are at all events in keeping with the circumstances of the metropolis in Paul's day.<sup>1</sup> These salutations from the palace of the Cæsars are of special interest as proving that the apostle's influence was felt in imperial circles. At the time of writing he seems to have been transferred from his private lodging to a State prison near the palace (Ph 1<sup>13</sup>), with consequent facilities for intercourse with the Christian section of the royal household.

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 169 ff. See also Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans*, p. 418 ff. Bartoli has now convincingly proved that at a later date, side by side with the old Pagan shrine, a Christian church stood within the palace of the Cæsars.



PART THREE  
THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND



## CHAPTER I

THE main factors to be considered here are the great Paganisms of Greece and Rome, the cult of the Mystery Religions, the teaching of Zoroaster, and the religious civilization of the Hebrews.

### I. PAGANISM AS REPRESENTED BY GREEK RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

#### (I) THE POETIC DEVELOPMENT FROM HOMER TO SOPHOCLES

(a) *The Olympian Theology: Homer and Hesiod.*—Quite the earliest exponents of Greek theology were the poets. According to Herodotus (ii. 53), "it was Homer and Hesiod who made the Greek theogony, assigned to the gods their appellations, distinguished their provinces and arts, and indicated their various forms." Not that the Greek pantheon was simply evolved from their imagination, for the elements of it they no doubt found ready to hand. But it is probably in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that they were first compacted into a regular system, and this is presumably what 'the Father of History' intended to convey. At all events Homer came to be regarded not merely as a poet, but also as a great religious teacher whose conceptions of the divine had a marked influence upon Greek life and conduct. On controversial questions his authority was appealed to, "just as texts of the Bible are quoted in modern times."<sup>1</sup> In the estimation of some enthusiasts his position was analogous to that accorded by Moham-

<sup>1</sup> Grote, *Plato*, i. p. 455.

medans to the Koran, everything not in Homer being reckoned either superfluous or false. As happened afterwards in the case of the OT and other literature, the text of his poems was subjected to allegorical interpretation, and made to yield whatever sense expositors desired. Later Greek writers were fond of citing Homer and Hesiod in support of their views. Thus the example of Zeus, who imprisoned his father Kronos, is pled in extenuation of unfilial conduct. The Homeric theology, however, did not escape criticism, and the development of Greek religious thought was the resultant outcome of the struggle between its champions and its opponents. Its religious value has been recently affirmed by Professor Gilbert Murray.

It is an outstanding feature in the Homeric conception of the divine that everything in nature, life, and history is referred directly to the personal action of one or other of the deities. Although Fate is sometimes represented as a power superior to gods and men alike, and Zeus as the sovereign lord of heaven, the standpoint is essentially polytheistic. At most the different deities are controlled by Zeus and Fate. Notwithstanding a well-marked vein of religious idealism, all Homer's gods are simply "immortal men," and his way of speaking of them is as anthropomorphic as his general conception of them is humanistic. The presence of this dualistic strain makes it impossible to frame any coherent picture of the Homeric gods in their distinctive features. Physically, they eat and sleep as men do ; they have a dwelling-place, usually in Olympus, but sometimes, as in the case of Poseidon, in the particular elements under their sway ; and they are subject to pain. Yet they are in many respects distinguished from mortals. They live on nectar and ambrosia ; not blood, but ichor, pulses through their veins ; they are stronger and swifter and more comely than men, and are frequently represented as omnipotent. There is even an un-

conscious tendency to spiritualize the Deity, as when the bow is struck from the hands of Teucer by the invisible and far-distant Zeus (*Il.* 15. 461 ff.). Intellectually, the gods "know all things" (*Od.* 4. 379, 468), yet this claim is contradicted by numerous incidents in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which portray Zeus himself as capable of being overreached. Ethically, the gods of Homer are in no way superior to their worshippers; indeed, they are notoriously envious and immoral. If they are the source of manifold blessing, they are also the cause of much evil; they even arbitrarily bring misfortune upon men, and deceive and incite them to sin. This dualistic conception may be due to a lapse from primitive purity, but is more probably the result of building upon a groundwork of ancient superstition. Worship is expressed through sacrifice and prayer, but the oblations are rather a compulsory payment of tribute than a grateful homage, and the prayers are not for deliverance from evil, but for rescue from personal danger or for victory over an enemy. In the Homeric age piety is mainly a matter of ritual. Gifts may propitiate the offended deities, who extend or deny forgiveness according to the whim of the moment, and are more careful to punish sin than to reward virtue. In its ethical ideals for man the Homeric poetry reaches a high level, but on the problem of the hereafter it throws no light. Even the Elysian fields are but an earthly paradise reserved for the favoured few to whom the gods have granted immunity from death, and the outlook upon the future destiny of man is gloomy in the extreme.

The theological ideas of Hesiod (c. B.C. 800), who lacks the religious idealism of Homer, are contained in two poems, the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. In the first of these is developed the idea of successive and temporary dynasties of gods, which, however, if less violent, are also, with the exception of the Fates, less moral than the Homeric deities. In his *Works and Days*



Hesiod with evident sincerity lays down moral precepts and imparts religious knowledge. He represents man as entirely dependent on the gods, and Zeus as the dispenser of justice, with hosts of intermediate and invisible dæmons as his messengers. While teaching equally with Homer the punishment of sin, Hesiod lays more stress on the reward of virtue. On the other hand, his conception of worship is inferior to the Homeric, incense-offering being naively prescribed as enabling a man to buy up his neighbour's plot of ground. Yet he enjoins the practice of justice, kindness, and hospitality, although he also advises the avenging of injuries. As one belonging to the Iron Age, the poet explains the origin of the evils that fill land and sea by the well-known legends of Prometheus and Pandora, and represents the creation of woman as the punishment that befel mankind. Hesiod is a great apostle of labour, which he regards as the sole path to virtue. On the question of a blissful future for disembodied spirits he is no more sanguine than Homer.<sup>1</sup>

In the lyric and elegiac poetry of the period B.C. 500–400, the course of human life is represented as determined absolutely by the gods, who “accomplish all according to their will” (*Theognis*, 141 f.). The supremacy of Zeus, the punisher of the guilty even to succeeding generations, is more marked than in the Homeric poetry (*Solon*, 12. 17 ff.). Already, however, *Theognis* is puzzled over the problem of the afflictions of the just who are punished for the sins of their fathers (*Theognis*, 373 ff., 737 ff.), although he still takes the view that the source of evil is with the gods. Bacchylides (B.C. 510–450), on the contrary, holds man himself responsible. If the conception of the morality of the gods is loftier,

<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of note, however, that in one of the so-called *Homeric Hymns*—that to Demeter—happiness hereafter is promised to those who have been initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries; but even the earliest of these is probably later than Hesiod.

that of man's future destiny is no brighter than in Homer.

(b) *The Orphic Theology*.—The rise of Orphism is obscure. Our sources of information—Empedocles, Plato, and certain inscriptions—date from the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ. It is, however, certain that Orphism already existed in the sixth century, and that it was a religious movement called forth by the social and political conflicts of at least three generations in Greece. Men were seeking what the Olympian deities could not supply, namely, the means of redemption from oppression and the woes of human life. The cleavage came to be religious as well as political, and the cult of Dionysus was popularly preferred to that of the gods of Olympus. The Orphics held that, although of divine origin, the soul of man has through its own guilt fallen from celestial bliss, and is meanwhile imprisoned in the body. Nor does release come to it with death, which plunges it into a series of fresh incarnations, known as the "circle of Necessity" or the "wheel of Generation." Their doctrine of the soul as a mixture of divine and baser elements had an important influence on subsequent Greek thought. According to the Orphics, the soul can escape from its prison-house only by becoming "pure" through an ascetic life, and by the observance of mystic rites and ceremonies prescribed by Dionysus through Orpheus his prophet. On leaving the body the soul undergoes further purification in an intermediate state. In this Orphic purgatory the unholy and unjust are immersed in a sea of mud. For those, however, who have sanctified themselves there is a glorious recompense; not only have they fellowship with gods and heroes, but themselves become "gods instead of mortals." It may further be noted that there was a vein of pantheism running through the Orphic theogonies; that in contrast to the Homeric poetry, in which the main interest attaches to this present world, the Orphic looks hopefully

to the future, regarding death as the gateway to the society of the immortals; and that his conception of heaven is that of a pleasant clime where, amid scenes of beauty, its denizens will enjoy a peaceful existence, and vary religious services with concerts and lectures, theatrical entertainments and gorgeous banquets. Orphism was by no means free from superstitious and debasing rites; mendicant priests and soothsayers dangled their wares before a too credulous public and traded upon their ignorance. Religious ecstasy is always morally perilous, and the Orphics probably were not immune from the normal results of a cult such as theirs. But in spite of these drawbacks Orphism enshrined a great idea, which, in combination with a contemporaneous philosophical movement, gave a powerful impetus to the development of ethics and religion. It was the first religion upon Greek soil to lay stress on the idea of redemption, and through its doctrine of future rewards also the first to furnish its votaries with a strong moral incentive.<sup>1</sup> "Like Buddhism and Christianity, Orphism was a religion of deliverance (λύσις), of salvation; the cry of the believer, like that of St. Paul, was: 'Who shall deliver me from this body of death?'"<sup>2</sup>

(c) *The Odes of Pindar*.—Born near Thebes about B.C. 522, Pindar became at an early age the accredited national lyric poet of Greece. Besides fragments, there have come down to us from his pen forty-four complete *Odes of Victory* (Επινίκια) in celebration of triumphs in the Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games. His favourite method is to seize on some heart-stirring legend connected with the victor or his birthplace and to point its moral. It is not only, however, as the poet of the national games and the chosen prophet of Apollo that Pindar deserves to rank as a religious writer; his own natural temperament is strongly religious. His

<sup>1</sup> On Orphic doctrines, see further, p. 267 f.

<sup>2</sup> Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, p. 98.

odes are not mere compositions written to order ; they are the expression of his own feelings. The point of view is uniformly polytheistic : " nearly every ode is full of gods." Although Pindar tones down the older anthropomorphism, the gods are in his conception but glorified men. They no longer, as in Homer, appear in the character of deceivers ; they are all-knowing as well as all-powerful ; and while punishing sin, they also reward virtue. Sin is viewed as presumptuous selfishness which excites the envy of the gods, and will be punished both here and hereafter. While to him man is " the phantom of a shadow," his outlook upon life is not that of a pessimist. On the contrary, he has the keen appreciation of a Greek for youth and beauty and the joyous side of human existence. Accepting the Orphic doctrine of the divine origin of the soul, he bases upon it the belief in immortality. He also concurs in the Orphic idea of " rebirth." Some obstinate sinners he represents as punished eternally by way of warning to others. Those destined to inhabit " the islands of the blest " owe their happiness not to the special favour of the gods, but to the fact that " thrice on either side of death," *i.e.* during a threefold succession of incarnations, they have " refrained their souls from wickedness." On the ground, however, that " mortal things befit a mortal," Pindar dissuades man from seeking to become divine, and in this respect parts company with Orphism.

(d) *The Religious Element in Greek Tragedy : Æschylus and Sophocles.*—As Pindar was the lyric, so Æschylus was the tragic poet, of all Greece. He was born at Eleusis in B.C. 525. Only seven of his seventy Tragedies have been preserved, but they clearly shew that he was not only a dramatic poet, but also a high-toned man of earnest spirit, and a profound religious teacher. Notwithstanding his belief in one supreme ruling will—that of Zeus—the general standpoint of Æschylus is polytheistic. On the question of the relationship between Zeus and Fate

his pronouncements are somewhat contradictory, except in *Prometheus Bound*, in which Fate is the superior power. But in this, as in his other tragedies, he indicates without ambiguity the conviction that there is an ulterior divine purpose tending to overrule evil for good. Æschylus is as much alive as were the writers of the OT to the problem presented by the prosperity of the wicked and the sufferings of the righteous, and although he offers no satisfactory solution of the enigma, he clings to the idea of a higher unity of the divine purpose as affording some explanation of the apparent clash of principles in the moral government of the world. In his view both the heavenly and the infernal gods are, under the constraint of Necessity, working out the same law of righteousness. With all the moral fervour of a Hebrew prophet he asserts the claims of justice, and insists that punishment must follow sin. According to Æschylus, "the envy of the gods" is called forth, not as was currently supposed by the mere fact of human success—although this seems to have formed part of his earlier creed—but by the pride and "overweening thoughts" (*Pers.* 829 f.; *Ag.* 749 ff.) begotten of prosperity. Dealing as he does with the deepest problems of religions and ethics, Æschylus has much to say about sin, not only in itself, but also in its development and in its consequences. To him sin is essentially insolence, madness, delusion—an invasion of the rights of gods or men, a frenzy obliterating moral distinctions, a vain attempt to grasp the unattainable. While not expressly repudiating the traditional view that sin is due to the agency of the gods, Æschylus makes the sinner himself in the first instance responsible. No constraint but that of his own will leads him to transgress, but swiftly upon his transgression follows the luring of the gods, whose toils no mortal may escape. Still more striking than his conception of sin as it affects the individual is the delineation given by Æschylus of its moral consequences as exhibited

in one generation after another of a family besmirched by crime. In the trilogy of the *Oresteia*, for example, the curse incurred by Atreus is repeated in the murder of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra, and again in that of Clytemnestra by Orestes. The descendants of a guilty ancestor are hopelessly involved in the coils of the un-sleeping Furies. Asserting that "the ancient fiend of Atreus dealt the blow," Clytemnestra tries to throw upon Fate the responsibility for her action, or at least a share of the blame (*παρὰιτλα*), but only to receive from Orestes the inexorable answer: "This fatal doom, then, it is Fate that sends" (*Chæphori*, 909 f.), as in obedience to Apollo he stabs her, though his own mother. This action, however, exposes him to the vengeance of the Furies, whose function it is to dog the footsteps of those who shed kindred blood. His position is that of one called to choose between two courses, both of which are attended with disaster. The ethical problem involved is that of satisfying the demands of justice without infringing the rights of the individual, and it is scarcely solved by the introduction of Athena in the *Eumenides* as mediating between Apollo and the Furies so as to procure the deliverance of Orestes from the curse, while the Furies are propitiated by the gift of an Athenian shrine. In the matter of the punishment of sin Æschylus is a firm exponent of the principle of retribution as advocated by the Furies and the Fates. The wrong-doer must himself endure the same suffering that he has inflicted on others:

Let murder on the murderous stroke await!  
Doer of wrong must suffer.

The effect of punishment in reforming the sinner himself is scarcely present to the poet's mind, though he sometimes expresses the view that by appointment of Zeus man is ordained to learn by suffering. In his eschatology, Æschylus differs from Homer in ascribing to the dead

intelligence and will, and in affirming a future judgement. He is silent regarding an Elysium for the just.

If Æschylus was the greatest, Sophocles was the most artistic and finished, of Greek tragic poets. He was born at Colonus, near Athens, in B.C. 495, and was the author of more than a hundred plays, of which only seven are extant. The writings of Sophocles are pervaded by a deeply religious spirit. With him all virtue is rooted in piety, and to "revere the gods" is the first of duties. For the most part he accepts without demur the traditional theology. Indeed, the only respect in which the polytheism of Sophocles differs from that of Homer is that in Sophocles there is implicit obedience to Zeus on the part of the other deities. Of fundamental importance in the religious creed of Sophocles is the idea of an eternal law, divine in its origin, unchangeable in its demands, higher and more imperative than the transitory statutes of man's enactment. This doctrine finds telling illustration in the *Antigone*, admittedly one of the most beautiful dramas ever written. Although King Creon had issued an edict forbidding the burial of Polyneices, brother of Antigone, she unhesitatingly fulfils a most sacred duty of Greek religion by sprinkling dust upon the corpse. While confessing that she has thereby transgressed the civil law, she appeals to a higher law which no edict of mortal man can override, and concerning which she says :

It is not of to-day, nor yesterday ;  
It lives for ever, none knows whence it is.

Sophocles, then, being judge, no monarch is entitled to set the duties of his subjects to himself in collision with the most binding duties of religion ; but when this *is* done, it is the divine law, and not the human, that must be obeyed. The ruin of Creon and his house is due to his defiance of the unwritten, indestructible laws of Heaven. Not that to Sophocles there is any necessary connexion

between sin and suffering ; Antigone, though " sinless in her crime," is ruthlessly slain ; the suffering of the individual is regarded as merely an element in the working out of the great plan of the universe. In fact, the standpoint of Sophocles is practically that of Paul when he declares that " all things work together for good to them that love God " (Ro 8<sup>29</sup>). He was a man of mild spirit, sympathetic and compassionate in his attitude to human frailty, so conciliatory as to be a mediator between conflicting currents of thought, and ever disposed to fall back upon the consolation that " great Zeus is still in heaven." He might have said with Browning :

God's in His heaven—  
All's right with the world.

Did he believe in a future life ? Beyond the fact that he makes Antigone express the hope that in another world she will be lovingly welcomed by her kith and kin, there appears to be nothing in his poetry that transcends the conception of Hades entertained by his predecessors, and the idea of future rewards does not bulk so largely in his poems as in those of Pindar. At the same time he was evidently no stranger to the idea of a life beyond the grave.

(e) *The Age of the Sophists and its Poetical Interpreter Euripides.*—Originally the Sophists were teachers whose special function it was to prepare their pupils for civic life. They aimed at imparting general culture, and not specialized instruction suited to any particular calling. For about a century (B.C. 450–350) they virtually performed in Greece the work assigned to the Arts Faculty in a modern university. There was no stereotyped course of study ; different teachers pursued various lines of erudition. As a result, the Sophists largely influenced literature and philosophy, as well as rhetoric, which bulked so prominently in their teaching as to give rise to the notion that they were mainly disputants less con-



cerned to arrive at truth than to score a dialectic victory. From Plato's time onward the vagaries of individual sophists were charged to the entire class, who were pilloried as a brotherhood at enmity with society and the commonwealth. In fact, however, they did not form a distinctive school at all, but were merely a group of educationists who followed their avocation independently of one another.

Among the people of Athens the speculations of the early physicists had led to the widespread philosophical scepticism. There was a growing disposition to call in question old and cherished beliefs, and although for a time this tendency was so far held in check, as is evident from the treatment meted out to Anaxagoras, Protagoras, and Socrates, it could not ultimately be repressed. A spirit of iconoclasm was abroad. Not only did the new rationalism look askance at the practice of divination ; it even made bold to deny the very existence of the gods. It was at this critical juncture that " Sophism " took its rise.

The first of the Sophists was Protagoras of Abdera, who in a treatise *On Truth* developed in a sceptical direction the teaching of the Eleatics. His argument is that if, as they affirm, all things are in perpetual motion, there can be no such thing as absolute or objective truth, but " Man is the measure of all things, of what is, that it is, and of what is not, that it is not." This means that each man is for himself the judge of what is true or false—a principle at variance with the Platonic position that the quality of an action is unaffected by the estimate put upon it by the doer himself. Holding the philosophic search for truth to be vain, Protagoras abandoned it in favour of the pursuit of " excellence " or " virtue." What he was concerned to do was not to propound a theory of the universe, but to impart higher education with a view to making men good citizens. Regarding the existence of the gods, his attitude was agnostic.

Owing to "the obscurity of the subject and the shortness of life," this, he said, was a matter beyond his knowledge. Such a pronouncement, however, was still resented as impiety; the treatise, *On the Gods*, which contained it, was publicly burnt, and Protagoras had to flee from Athens.

One of the most popular of the Sophists, famous for his apologue of *The Choice of Hercules*, was Prodicus of Ceos, who as a teacher of "virtue" combined ethics with literature. The belief in gods he ascribes to the tendency of primitive man to personify and deify things beneficial to human life, such as the sun, rivers, etc. To him Poseidon is only water, Demeter bread, and Dionysus wine. He takes up virtually atheistic ground. Other famous Sophists were Isocrates, the sophist of politics, and Hippias of Elis. Theologically they are of little account. Of the Sophists as a whole it may be said that they were characterized by a rationalistic and critical spirit which led them to examine and frequently to oppose conventional beliefs alike in religion, morals, and politics. But their teaching was almost wholly negative; they were destructive critics, not constructive thinkers.

In B.C. 484, according to the Parian Marble,<sup>1</sup> was born the tragic poet Euripides. Sharing as he did the rationalistic spirit of the Sophists, Euripides could not, like his predecessors, base his tragedy upon a religion which multitudes no longer believed in. To him its gods and heroes were not objects of implicit faith, and could only be utilized as a medium for the representation of the "passions and sorrows of everyday life." Not that he is always tilting against the traditional religious belief, but that he exhibits a revolutionary and iconoclastic spirit. Just here, indeed, we find his distinguishing characteristic as a dramatic poet. When, however, Aristophanes asserts that Euripides had

<sup>1</sup> See Gilbert Murray, *Euripides and his Age*, p. 22 f.

"brought men over to believe that there are no gods," he overshoots the mark. The real attitude of our poet toward the Greek polytheism would perhaps be best described by saying that it was one of fearless criticism. From this not Zeus himself is excepted. When Artemis is made to say that it was owing to "dread of Zeus" that she failed to save her loved and loyal Hippolytus from an unjust fate, the writer evidently means to express disapproval of the régime of the King of Heaven. In the *Madness of Heracles* the goddess Hera is similarly held up to reprobation for having brought undeserved woes upon one who had rendered signal service to his race: "To such a Goddess who shall pray now?"<sup>1</sup> Nor will Heracles accept the proffered consolation of Theseus that the gods themselves have erred and suffered. Indignantly he exclaims: "These be the minstrels' sorry tales."<sup>2</sup> What need of further examples? The real position of Euripides is summed up in a single line: "If the gods do anything base, they are not gods"<sup>3</sup>—an utter reversal of the saying of Sophocles: "Nothing to which the gods lead men is base."<sup>4</sup>

In thus repudiating the gods of Greece, did Euripides mean to proclaim himself an atheist? An isolated passage quoted by Justin Martyr from the *Bellerophon* (Frag. 286) lends some colour to this view:

Doth any say that there are gods in heaven?  
Nay, there are none.

But his prevailing attitude was rather one of puzzled doubt. Phrases like, "Zeus, whoever Zeus may be," and questions like, "Is it Fortune or some power divine that sways man's lot," shew that he had reached no firm footing in theology. At the same time he distinctly affirmed certain things to be essential to the conception of Deity. To his thinking, the true God has need of nothing (a sentiment echoed by Paul at Athens), is

<sup>1</sup> 1307.<sup>2</sup> 1346.<sup>3</sup> *Frag.* 292. 7.<sup>4</sup> *Frag.* 226.

morally good, and sets an example of righteousness to men. To any conceivable being who does not satisfy these tests he refuses the attribute of Deity, and so reflects the moral interest as well as the critical spirit of the fourth century B.C.

Very characteristic of Euripides is the tendency to weave philosophical theology into his poetry. An instance of this is the prayer of Hecuba in the *Daughters of Troy*.

O Earth's Upbearer, thou whose throne is Earth,  
Whoe'er thou be, O past our finding out,  
Zeus, be thou Nature's Law, or mind of man,  
To thee I pray ; for, treading soundless paths,  
In justice dost thou guide all mortal things.<sup>1</sup>

If Adam is right in interpreting "Earth's Upbearer" to mean Air, then the identification of Zeus on the one hand with Nature's Law, and on the other with the mind of man, seems to reflect the view of Diogenes, who deifies Air and ascribes to it the attribute of Intelligence. At all events running through the poet's words there is a distinct vein of pantheism. Inscrutable, however, as Zeus is, Hecuba represents him as guiding all mortal things "in justice." It is doubtful whether we have here, as Nestle maintains, the core of the Euripidean idea of Deity.<sup>2</sup> The poet's theological opinions never really crystallized, and as little did he arrive at a settled conviction about immortality. The influence of Euripides on religious thought was mainly in the direction of promoting the disintegration of the Homeric theology ; but if his work was rather that of demolition than of reconstruction, he has at least this to his credit, that

<sup>1</sup> 884-888. Way's tr.

<sup>2</sup> According to this scholar, Euripides found in the dictum of Heraclitus that "God accomplishes all things with a view to the harmony of the whole," an explanation of the enigmas of human life ; but this is more akin to the sentiments of Æschylus and Sophocles than to those of Euripides, to whom life's discords bulk more largely than the thought of the universal harmony.

by raising so many crucial questions he has stimulated religious thought in no ordinary degree.

## (2) THE PHILOSOPHICAL DEVELOPMENT

(a) *The Pre-Socratic Natural Philosophy*.—The leading thought of the earliest Greek philosophers was that underlying all special forms of existence there is an absolute principle of permanent unity. While the predecessors of Xenophanes (c. B.C. 550) had more or less occupied themselves with this conception, it is to him that we owe its first clear and definite expression. In particular, he assailed the Greek mythology as an anthropomorphic usurpation by one form of finite being of the position attributable only to the Absolute. In his vain ambition, man, he says, would fain think of God in terms of his own likeness, whereas God is the very negation of the finite. Between this idea and the philosophy of Heraclitus (c. B.C. 576–480), who taught the ceaseless change of matter along with the unchangeable equality of general relations, there is no essential opposition, seeing that the constant flux of the forms of the finite is but the obverse of the abiding unity of the whole. “The One remains, the many change and pass.” This leaves us, however, with only a pantheistic unity which is inconceivable as a spiritual ideal.

(b) *Socrates and Plato*.—One of the most renowned names among the philosophers of Greece is that of Socrates (B.C. 469–399), son of Sophroniscus, a statuary of Athens. A strong conviction that he had a divine mission to fulfil inspired all his intercourse with men. While fully performing his duties as a citizen, and winning distinction as a soldier, he considered himself debarred by his “divine voice” from entangling himself in politics.<sup>1</sup> Mentally and morally, the appearance of

<sup>1</sup> Yet he acted as a member of senate, and in B.C. 404 he even dared to defy the “Thirty,” who had overthrown the constitution.

Socrates inaugurated a new epoch in Greek thought. Although sometimes classed with the Sophists, his aims and practice differed materially from theirs, as well as from those of the physicists and metaphysicians to whom the title of philosopher is more strictly applied. The whole trend of his thought was practical, not speculative. Turning away from the vain endeavour to reach absolute truth, and to find an explanation of the unity of the world, he became the interpreter of the new sense of individuality which was beginning to undermine the hitherto well-compacted organism of Greek society. Socrates was essentially a man with a message—that of the transcendent worth of the human soul. To him the supreme concern was the moral perfection of himself and his fellow-citizens. It is his proud distinction to have made philosophy ethical; in the memorable words of Cicero he “brought it down from heaven to earth.” The early thinkers of Greece were pure scientists to whom moral and spiritual problems did not appeal. Hitherto the great theme of investigation had been matter; henceforth it was to be mind. In the philosophy of Socrates God is conceived as the Reason that dwells in and rules over the world, and Nature as bearing in its manifold aspects the unmistakable impress of design. Although his immediate aim is not theological, but hortatory, the history of theism has been profoundly influenced by the strength of his teleological argument. It is, however, on its ethical side that the teaching of Socrates is of superlative value. The task he set himself was to teach his fellows “how to make the soul as good as possible,” and certainly no one has ever handled in more masterly fashion questions of right and wrong in the various relations of human life. His fundamental doctrine is that virtue consists in knowledge. According to Socrates, the ills that beset society, as well as radical defects in the individual, are not the fruit of scepticism, but of ignorance. In the

case of any ordinary craft or trade he who has knowledge, he says, will act properly, while he who is ignorant will blunder. Nor is it otherwise as regards the art of living ; here, too, wrong action is the child of ignorance. On the other hand, the knowledge of the good will lead to right action. By knowledge Socrates does not mean wide acquaintance with facts, but a principle which through the intellect dominates the whole personality. For him knowledge is inseparable from life and character, and a vicious person simply does not possess it. The several virtues are but names for various aspects of the same practical wisdom which alone he recognizes as knowledge. Piety is the knowledge of what is due to the gods ; justice, the knowledge of what is due to men ; courage, the knowledge of what is to be dreaded, and what not. To be temperate is to know how to choose the good and shun the evil. In his day men were prevented from attaining to true knowledge both by the superficiality of unquestioned tradition and by the mere semblance of wisdom derived from the Sophists. The prime requisite, therefore, of moral education as laid down by Socrates was *know thyself*. But by this self-knowledge he intended nothing metaphysical ; he had in view only that practical knowledge which influences conduct. His demand is that in every relation of life men should know what they are doing, and why—that action should proceed upon some well-defined and consistent principle. To enable the Athenians to arrive at such knowledge he deemed to be his special calling, and the favourite method which he employed was that of dialogue. His first care was to disillusionize those with whom he conversed. By fixing upon definite examples, and by a process of cross-examination conducted with painstaking and remorseless logic, he led his victim to resile from one definition after another of some ethical notion until, entangled in a web of contradictions, he was fain to confess his ignorance, and the

folly of what he had accounted wisdom. This purging process, however, Socrates regarded as only the necessary preliminary to arriving at some principle consonant with reason, which he then proceeded to apply to specific and concrete cases as a rule of conduct. For the materials of his inductive argument he had recourse to the ordinary affairs of everyday life, his aim being not to impose knowledge from without, but to evolve it from within. The object of knowledge, according to Socrates, is the good. He is virtuous who knows what is right and good. Every practical error in human life is due to ignorance of the good and evil. All men desire the good, and "no one is willingly evil," or knowingly does anything but the good, because he deems this the useful, the advantageous. By the good, then, he means not only the morally right, but also the useful. In his estimation indeed the good and the beautiful are the useful; but while the two categories are identified, the application of the term "useful" is exclusively to the soul, in the well-being of which virtue is held to consist. Thus understood, utility becomes the standard of conduct and the basis of legislation. The notion of the good as conceived by Socrates represents therefore a combination of duty and interest.

Whether or not himself a believer in the gods of Greece, Socrates taught that men should express their sense of the divine goodness by worshipping God according to the usage of their country or city as prescribed by the Delphic oracle. The underlying presuppositions are that men everywhere have the same instinct for worship; that, however varied their religious ceremonial, it is the same God whom they severally adore; and that in worship the important thing is not the outward form but the animating spirit. His inculcation of piety is not based, however, on any clear view of immortality. On this question, indeed, his attitude is agnostic; he is content to say that the



good man has nothing to dread either from life or death.

The influence of Socrates upon his immediate disciples was magnetic and unique. Upon the wider stage of the history of morals it has been scarcely less extraordinary. Wherein then lay his power? The answer admits of no doubt: it lay in the impression produced by his personal character, in what he shewed himself to be in life and in death; it was due to his sympathy, humour, irony, intense earnestness, and strength of will. His personality was even greater than his teaching. It is Xenophon's beautiful tribute that "he was so pious that he did nothing without taking counsel with the gods; so upright that he never did the slightest injury to any living soul; so self-controlled that he never at any time chose the pleasant rather than the good. . . . He was the very ideal of human excellence and happiness" (*Mem.* iv. 8. 11). How are we to account for such a man having been adjudged to die on a charge of setting up strange divinities and corrupting youth? So far as the causes were political—though he was no more friendly to oligarchy than to democracy—the main factor probably lay in his association with Critias and Alcibiades, and thus indirectly with the tyranny of the "Thirty." If he had taught them, he might teach others with similar results, and so endanger the State. But the real explanation lies much deeper. In this tragic event we see the clashing of two opposing ideals of religion and life—the one, that of the authority of prevailing custom and tradition, the other, that of independent judgement based on personal knowledge and conviction. For the moment the old narrow Hellenic view prevailed, but only for the moment. Conformity to an external standard sanctioned by tradition was henceforth gradually to give place to the rule of internal consistency, in virtue of which every man was to aim at being true to himself. "Socrates was put to death, but the Socratic philosophy rose like the

sun in the heavens, and spread its illumination over the whole intellectual firmament." <sup>1</sup> History has few grander things to record than the martyrdom of this Athenian sage. As he disclaimed all fear of death, <sup>2</sup> declared the necessity of obeying God rather than his judges, and expressed his determination to point out the right way to his fellows so long as he had breath, the true greatness of his personality shone forth with a splendour which the lapse of ages has left undimmed. For, viewed in this connexion, Socrates is no longer merely the ethical teacher of the useful, but a strikingly novel figure in the ancient world, a veritable "forerunner and prophet of Christianity," <sup>3</sup> and that, too, in the proudest citadel of paganism. Remarkably enough, he predicted the coming of a divinely commissioned messenger who should bring "further illumination" to mankind, but on broader grounds than this he deserves to take distinguished rank among those who prepared the way of the Lord.

Plato (B.C. 427-347), although belonging to an aristocratic family of Athens, was the intimate friend and devoted admirer of the humbly-born Socrates. He became the founder, and until his death acted as the president, of the philosophical school of the Academy. Reared in an atmosphere charged with the sceptical tendencies begotten of the Sophistic movement, he was from his youth accustomed to hear the problems of life freely debated. But while he felt the craving for scientific knowledge, his was also the spirit of the poet and the seer, and it is to the combination in him of these two moods of mind that his pre-eminence as a philosopher is due. Although as a disciple of Socrates he

<sup>1</sup> John Stuart Mill.

<sup>2</sup> "Socrates had no desire to die, but he kept his cheerful confidence, since no divine admonition had warned him not to come to the trial."—*Scotsman* report of N. Söderblom's Gifford Lecture.

<sup>3</sup> Pfeiderer, *Die Vorbereitung des Christentums in der Griechischen Philosophie*, p. 11.

subjected the general beliefs of his time to the test of the dialectic method he did not regard this as the sole or even the principal instrument for arriving at the highest truths. To him the greatest necessity of the philosopher is not any argumentative process, but the intuitive apprehension of spiritual "Ideas," and particularly of moral facts.

The central theme of the Platonic philosophy is the theory of Ideas. While sharing the Socratic interest in problems of conduct, Plato sought also to build up a philosophical system explanatory at once of man and the universe. Socrates, holding that virtue is knowledge, and that the essence of knowledge lies in the concept, had aimed at the exact definition of ethical concepts through the elimination of all non-essential qualities. Plato did not neglect this line of investigation, but became increasingly engrossed with the question as to "the significance of our conceptional knowledge as such." With all our efforts to arrive at clear conceptions, can we be certain about the possibility of our ever beholding absolute truth? To this Plato replies that true being is so far recognizable through concepts perceptible to the reason. There are two sorts of knowledge, and corresponding to these, two sorts of being. While by means of the senses we apprehend the constantly shifting phenomena of nature, in thought we are enabled to grasp the eternal realities of which these are but the reflexion. Abstract definition, if logically sound, is thus also a step towards beholding that which really exists. The average man, indeed, is like a chained prisoner in a cave, who perceives only the shadows of what is passing outside, and mistakes these for realities. But not so the emancipated soul which has entered into the light of the invisible and is capable of direct contact with reality.

What, then, according to Plato, are the ultimate realities? They are the Ideas or perfect forms existing in a higher world of whatever through our senses we

become aware of in the material world. Thus the perfect table is not here, but yonder. Our conception of a statesman, of beauty, or courage, or any other virtue, represents only an approximation toward seeing the super-sensible reality, namely, the perfect statesman, the perfect beauty, courage, etc., actually existing in the invisible world. Such is Plato's theory of Ideas. They are that which truly is as distinguished from that which seems; that which is one in contrast to that which is manifold; that which is eternal, as opposed to that which comes into existence, grows, and vanishes. As fixed and stable, they are the object of true knowledge, in contrast to the changing phenomena of sense, which are the object of opinion only. The two categories are related as substance to shadow. It is the function of sensible objects to awaken the mind to perceive the idea, which is the sole reality. The value of the distinction thus drawn between the two worlds of sense and of ideas lay in this, that it exhibited true knowledge as being on a loftier level and concerned with higher objects than the ever-changing perceptions and impressions of everyday life. Although Plato did not himself succeed in clearing up the relation between the Idea and its image so as to shew how we can pass from the perception of the one to the contemplation of the other, he nevertheless through his theory of Ideas laid the foundation for all future efforts to estimate the significance for our life of the sensible universe, and to discover to us through the medium of the visible and transitory the unseen and eternal. The theory in itself, in so far as it ascribes independent being to general concepts, is certainly a "naïve error," yet it was by its help that Plato arrived at the new thought of a spiritual world possessing transcendent worth. His theology was the result of a twofold process of development: it represents on the one hand a blending of the theory of Ideas with the Orphic doctrine of the soul, and on the other, a com-

pound of the supreme Idea of the good with the fitly governing world-reason of Anaxagoras. If in ascribing independent being to the general concepts of the Socratic philosophy Plato did not exactly co-ordinate Ideas and souls—he could not do so because the special characteristics of lifeless things attached to the Ideas—he nevertheless so placed them in juxtaposition as to render possible a certain fusion of both from which arose the new thought of spirit.

Plato teaches that there is in man a higher and an inferior soul. The higher or rational part contains a divine and immortal element; the lower part, on the contrary, has no existence prior to incarnation, and is mortal and perishable. With regard to the manner in which the soul became connected with an earthly body, Plato's (perhaps poetical) theory is that while in every soul there is an element of the divine proceeding from the supreme God himself, namely, Reason ("the eye of the soul"), the perishable part of the soul, along with the perishable body, has been fashioned by the minor or created gods (the sun, moon, planets, etc.) at the instance of the Demiurgus or Creator. To illustrate his meaning, Plato in the *Phædrus* draws a beautiful picture in which he likens the soul to one who rides in a chariot yoked with two horses, a noble fair steed which seeks to conduct him to the heights of heaven and the vision of truth and beauty, and a dark ill-conditioned animal which always tries to drag the rider downwards to a low and sensual life. The soul that suffers itself to be thus dragged down loses the vision of truth, and must inhabit a mortal body of a higher or lower grade according to the measure of vision still possessed by it. That is, if the Reason fails to bring the other parts of the soul into subjection, it undergoes various transmigrations till it succeeds. Plato's theory is thus associated with the Pythagorean doctrine of reincarnation. The first earthly life ended, the soul must appear for judgement, and will then either

enter on a blessed heavenly life or be sent to a place of punishment under the earth. After a thousand years the soul will re-enter the circle of incarnation, and may, through recollection of what it has beheld of the divine, again attain to heavenly bliss in the three-thousandth year. The essential significance of this pictorial representation is that the connexion of soul or body was originally due to the overmastering of the nobler by the more ignoble part of man's nature.<sup>1</sup>

By what means, then, according to Plato, is the soul to shake off its fetters? To this his writings furnish no stereotyped reply. In the *Phædo*, for example, he teaches that the way of deliverance from evil lies through mortification of the body. In the *Banquet*, again, stress is laid not on asceticism, but on the love of Beauty and Goodness as the means of rising from earth to heaven. Once more, in the *Republic*, we are pointed to Education as the medium by which the soul's elevation takes place.

Still interesting, and partly valid, though now out of date, are Plato's arguments in the *Phædo* for the immortality of the (higher) soul. Far more cogent, however, than all the arguments in the *Phædo*, is the calm and noble bearing of Socrates himself. His "intrepid and generous death" is explicable only on the view that the soul is immortal.

Plato's theory of Ideas further enabled him to excogitate a systematized conception of the world from a teleological point of view. Anaxagoras had already taught that God as the supreme Being utilized the *Nous* as the regulative principle of the universe, but without representing it as the cause of the world's conformity to design. This step was now taken by Plato, who main-

<sup>1</sup> In the *Timæus*, one of the later dialogues, the descent of the soul into an earthly body is not attributed to any such fall into sin, but to fore-ordination. The lower impulses are viewed as a kind of temporary parasitic growth upon the eternal or rational part of the soul; they had no existence before its incarnation, but spring from, and are put off with, the body.

tained that the Nous deliberately fashioned the world after the pattern of its own perfections. As Intelligence a supreme Mind cannot, he contended, work in a purposeless way ; but as the perfect Intelligence can suitably aim only at that which is best, the world must be regarded as the reflexion of its own qualities. Yet the divine essence consists not in Intelligence, but in the Idea of the Good. This, the supreme idea of all, and that which binds the several ideas together, is freely personified, and becomes an object of religious homage. What the sun is to the natural world, that, says Plato, is the idea of good to the intellectual world. Visible objects become visible only when the sun shines upon them ; and truth remains hidden until disclosed by the idea of good. The idea of good is thus the source alike of being and of knowledge, but at the same time it is higher than knowledge, and far exceeds being in dignity and power. In short, it is God.<sup>1</sup> As Pfeiderer has pointed out, this conception of God as the perfect creative Spirit swept away the relics of naturalism in the thought of Anaxagoras. It also completed the work of Socrates in combating the relativity of the Sophistic code of morals by tracing back the morally good to an absolute metaphysical principle, to God as at once the world's originating cause and its highest end. In this way Plato has laid the foundation for a speculative theology in which metaphysics and ethics are combined into a unity.<sup>2</sup> His cosmology, too, has a decidedly theological character ; the moving cause is the divine Mind.

In his ethical views Plato is necessarily influenced by his dualistic philosophy of religion. To a certain extent he succeeded in arriving at the ethical conception of God. In his identification of God with the good, in his designation of God as the Father of the universe, and in

<sup>1</sup> The identification has been denied by some, but the argument for it seems conclusive. See Adam, *op. cit.* p. 442 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 18.

his declaration that God is self-communicating, he gives expression to a truly moral conception of Deity. At the same time he is conscious of the difficulty of finding God, and of the impossibility of making Him known to all men when found—obviously an anti-Christian feature in his teaching. His ethical view of the world and life is also coloured by his Hellenic dualism. It is this that leads him to regard the body as the prison-house of the soul, and to shroud the whole world of sense in a veil of melancholy. Here, too, we find the explanation of his mysticism, of his preference for the contemplative life, and of his exhortation “to fly away from earth to heaven as quickly as we can.” This flight from the world consists in becoming as far as possible like God, *i.e.* holy, just, and wise. We can discern here a certain foreshadowing of the Christian gospel, according to which the divine love has communicated itself to us in Christ. And Plato’s contention that virtue consists not merely in the avoiding of evil for politic ends, but in the knowledge that God is perfect righteousness, and that he who is the most righteous is most like Him, represents a real advance in moral science. The Platonic dualism, moreover, furnishes a real basis for morality. In the continual warfare between the Idea of the good and the forces that make for evil, man can range himself on the divine side in furthering the triumph of good; and it is just the presence of evil that gives him his opportunity. If Plato’s idealistic and ascetic point of view must be pronounced one-sided in so far as it tends to depreciate civic morality, it was also the avenue by which he reached the great and new thought of the absolute worth of moral good. Once this principle has been grasped as the standard of moral judgements, we are provided with a “categorical imperative,” and with the means of estimating the relative value of things. Indeed, we have here an approximation to the pungent saying of Jesus: “What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole



world, and lose his own soul ? ” In opposition to this dualism, however, Christianity teaches that God combines in Himself infinite love and power, and that in the beginning He created the world. It rejects the Platonic notion of matter existing independently of God.

Plato's theory of virtue<sup>1</sup> is most fully developed in the *Republic*. By the time this dialogue was written he had departed from the Socratic view that virtue is knowledge, and adopted, perhaps under Pythagorean influence, the theory of virtue as an order or harmony of the soul.<sup>2</sup> The same position is affirmed in the *Philebus*, in which Plato opposes alike the Cyrenaic doctrine that the highest good consists in pleasure, and the Cynic view that it consists solely in wisdom. Pure pleasure, Plato maintains, is the lowest in the order of goods ; above it rank sciences, arts, and true opinions ; higher again than these are mind and wisdom ; higher still are to be reckoned the symmetrical and perfect ; but the highest place of all must be assigned to measure, or the mean in which the eternal nature is found. This, then, is the highest good. Virtue is no longer identified with knowledge, but consists in that harmonious union of all the constituent parts of the soul which is essential to its true health. Thus only can man attain to likeness to God and participate in the Idea of Good.

According to the Platonic teaching, therefore, virtue is the indispensable condition of the soul's health and happiness. This is a root principle involving important consequences. It leads Plato, for instance, to dismiss with scorn the utilitarian question concerning the relative serviceableness to men of virtue and its opposite. Quite consistently, too, he rejects the hitherto accepted view, shared even by Socrates, that it behoves men to do good to their friends, but evil to their enemies. “ It is better

<sup>1</sup> By 'Αρετή (frequently synonymous with δικαιοσύνη and σωφροσύνη) Plato means a right state of the soul.

<sup>2</sup> μέτρον.

to suffer than to inflict a wrong," says this prince of Greek philosophers, and in this we recognize a remarkable approach to the great principle of Christian ethics. The portraiture of the ideally righteous man drawn in the *Republic* is, moreover, truly prophetic, and came to realization in the history of Jesus Christ. According to Plato's forecast, the just man, stripped of all but his virtue, while really the best of men, must be put to the test by being counted the worst. He must shew himself impervious to calumny and its consequences, and this even unto death, for he will be "scourged, racked, bound, deprived of eyesight by heated iron, and at last nailed to a stake" (*Repub.*, ii. 361).

It is, however, with social ethics that Plato mainly deals. In his view it is not so much in the life of the individual as in the collective life of the State that the ideal of righteousness can be completely realized. As the righteousness of the individual soul consists in the proper harmony of the three elements of which it is composed (reason, will, and passion), so also the righteousness of the State consists in every one doing his own work and receiving his own due. Plato is utterly opposed to the democratic practice according to which any citizen may aspire to the most lucrative posts irrespective of his fitness to fill them. The meddling of one class with the affairs of another he regards as harmful to the State. Here he joins issue with the Sophists, whose doctrines were subversive of law and custom, and pleads for a State governed by Reason. In such a State, corresponding to the three parts of the soul, there are three main divisions or classes, namely, traders, warriors, and legislators. The just State is thus the replica of the just man. As each part in the individual soul has its own function, so each of the three classes will perform the functions of its own class in the State. The merchants will see to the provision of the material necessities of life; all questions affecting the danger and extension

of the State will be attended to by the warriors ; while the statesmen will advise " not about any particular thing in the State, but about the whole, and consider how it can best deal with itself and with other States " (*Repub.*, iv. 428).

In the *Republic* as a whole, permeated as it is by the idea of the divine, we have what may colourably be termed Plato's conception of the Kingdom of God upon earth. The philosopher is blessed because he loves and enjoys the highest good, *i.e.*, God. But while Plato sets before men the noble ideal of being trained to know God and practise virtue, he confines it within the narrow limits of the Hellenic State, and even so it presents features which make its realization in practice impossible. Among these the most extraordinary is the advocacy of a community of wives and children. Nothing could be more contrary to Christian ideas of morality. Between the higher and lower classes there is, moreover, a great gulf fixed. The masses, absorbed in their own meaner interests, have no part or lot in the loftier aims of the State, and no concern with the investigations of science or the search after truth. Those, again, who form the upper ranks of society, must sacrifice their own individuality, and be content to live within the charmed circle of abstract Ideas—the Ideas of God, of science, and of the State. That is to say, the man is sunk in the philosopher. " This philosophical City of God belongs only to the cultured few, who are rich in spirit ; for the many poor in spirit, it has no salvation, no Gospel." <sup>1</sup>

(c) *The Philosophy of Aristotle*.—Aristotle (B.C. 384–322), the son of Nicomachus, was born at Stageira in Thrace. For twenty years he sat at the feet of Plato, who called him " the mind of his school." <sup>2</sup> After the

<sup>1</sup> Pfeiderer, *op. cit.* p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> More than sixteen centuries later Dante designated him " the master of those that know " (*Inferno*, iv. 131).

death of his master he was entrusted by Philip of Macedon with the education of his remarkable son Alexander. On the accession of Alexander to the throne, Aristotle repaired again to Athens, where he founded the Peripatetic school as a rival to the Academy.<sup>1</sup> There also during the last thirteen years of his life he seems to have written all his extant works. Falsely arraigned before the Areopagus for "impiety," he fled to Chalcis in Eubœa, remarking in allusion to the death of Socrates that he was averse to giving the Athenians another opportunity of sinning against philosophy; but within a year he died.

While revering Plato as his teacher, Aristotle was too independent a thinker to be the mere echo of any other man, and the most cursory reader must be conscious at once of certain broad differences between these two great philosophers. Though far less poetic than Plato, Aristotle had no quarrel with poetry. He simply cared nothing for dramatic form, but aimed at pure science, even in philosophy, and insisted on the necessity of experience as furnishing the data for Reason to work upon. To say, however, that Plato is an idealist, and Aristotle a materialist, is a defective way of distinguishing between them, for although Aristotle is more of an empiricist than Plato, he admits that science can be built only upon reason. While Plato gave a more scientific form to the Socratic method of investigation, the method of Aristotle was rather that of demonstration. He was essentially a Logician. By means of the Syllogism he gave still greater precision to the Socratic Induction than had been given by the Analysis of Plato. The radical difference between them, however, lies in their attitude towards the theory of Ideas. While Plato regarded Ideas as objective existences, Aristotle

<sup>1</sup> His teaching is said to have been delivered to his pupils while pacing up and down a covered walk (*περιπατος*) encircling the Lyceum; hence the term "Peripatetic" as applied to his philosophy.

held that they are merely abstractions of the Reason, and expressions of the relations of individual things. In his view Plato unwarrantably multiplied the number of existences by denuding things of their qualities and making these qualities into separate entities. Thus, *e.g.*, a coriander seed is reckoned small and white, but on Plato's theory the attributes of size and colour are separated and accounted new existences. Another criticism made by Aristotle is that on the Platonic theory there would be various "forms" for the same thing, since the same thing may be classed under several categories. Socrates, for instance, would have a manifold existence under the objective ideas of Socrates, of man, of animal, and of biped; or of philosopher, of general, and of statesman. On these and other grounds the Stagirite denies the doctrine of Ideas, and attributes existence solely to individual things. With Plato he recognized that Ideas are the necessary basis of science, and also that they must be acquired through reminiscence; not, however, as Plato maintained, through remembrance of a previous existence, but of a past experience. By remembering former sensations we arrive at the art of Induction, or generalization from numerous instances. In practice, however, Aristotle did not confine himself to his own excellent rule, but had recourse to *à priori* methods, and ventured to draw conclusions without having established his premises. He became a metaphysician, and cherished the mistaken notion that science is capable of solving all the problems and mysteries of being.

Owing to the very partial preservation of the theological part of Aristotle's system, it is not easy to arrive at clearness regarding his conception of the Deity. But in Book xii. of his *Metaphysics* this is presented as the necessary sequel to his teleological view of the world, and that in a form which entitles it to rank as the first attempt to furnish a scientific basis for theism. Reason-

ing back from the world of being to its ultimate ground, he reaches the thought of God as the absolute self-conscious spirit, eternal and unchangeable. Himself immovable, He moves all things, and He does so as the object of contemplation and desire on the part of the world. The cause of all motion is not a mere possibility, but an actuality. It is incorporeal, since everything is material and changeable, and exists only in so far as it has the capacity for becoming actual through specific form ; and it is without magnitude, for otherwise it would be limited, and could not be the cause of an eternal movement. It is therefore pure bodiless energy. Now, only thought answers to this description : God is thought. The thought of God, however, can have no other object but the highest and best, that is, itself, and therein consists the perfection and self-conscious blessedness of the life of God—a perpetual blessedness of which our highest moods can give us only a faint indication or passing glimpse. Thus the Aristotelian philosophy conducts us over the world of being to God as the highest moving and telic cause of the whole.

In Aristotle's conception of God, so far as deducible from his extant writings, there is an element of confusion in the way in which God is spoken of sometimes impersonally as the supreme good and object of the world's desire, and at other times personally as a thinking subject. It is not clear whether he affirms the transcendence or immanence of the Deity. He "seems to say that God can be conceived of both ways, just as the army implies both discipline and general, but it is the general who produces the discipline."<sup>1</sup> Herein is at least indicated the far-reaching conception that God exists in Himself *above* the world as the self-conscious Spirit, and at the same time also *in* the world viewed as an organic unity which is the realization of the divine purpose. God is thus at once the order of the world, and He who

<sup>1</sup> Grant, *Ethics of Aristotle*, i. p. 292.

thinks it. If, however, it be asked how the content of the divine thought is realized in the material world, with its relations of time and space, the Aristotelian metaphysic furnishes no satisfactory answer. Of creation there can be no question; it is excluded by Aristotle's theory of the divine activity as limited to the unchangeable thought of the perfect. The Stagirite's point of view has been happily summed up in the sharp antithesis: "God does not love the world, but the world loves God."<sup>1</sup> If God draws the world toward the perfect ideal, it is not because, as Plato believes, He is moved by love to impart Himself, but simply because the world's capacity for development into a teleological world-process is stirred into exercise through its contemplation of the Godhead. As the object of contemplation He becomes the object of desire. Thus the world strives after God. "Aristotle seems to anticipate the doctrine of St. Paul that 'the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God'; and that we also, who 'have received the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting' for the fuller realization of the divine nature in us."<sup>2</sup> But here a fresh difficulty arises: how can unconscious matter be attracted by the absolute self-conscious Spirit? As we now know, material bodies affect each other in accordance with the law of gravitation, but can any such law regulate the relations between mind and matter? To say with Aristotle that lifeless matter is the antithesis to God, and yet that in its striving after God we are to seek the explanation of the "becoming" of the actual world of space and time, is to speak in contradictory terms. The Aristotelian metaphysic, in short, leaves the problem of a dualistic opposition between God and the world still more acute than does the philosophy of Plato.

<sup>1</sup> Pfleiderer, *op. cit.* p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> E. Caird, *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, ii. p. 29.

On passing to its doctrine of man we are confronted with a similar contrast. According to Aristotle, human nature consists of an animal or bodily soul *plus* "actual reason"—a pure spiritual essence, which is of divine origin and does not perish with the body. This is distinct from the "suffering reason," which constitutes a sort of link between the animal soul and pure thought. But as all the soul's energies, desires, and feelings are bound up with the suffering reason, it is not clear wherein the real human *Ego* consists. Is it to be identified with man's practical activity in the outer world, or merely with his contemplation of ideal forms? In the latter case reason is concerned only with philosophic thought, and does not enter the domain of practical life. Even Plato is by no means free from this philosophical intellectualism, but in his case it is largely toned down by his poetic and religious temperament. With Aristotle philosophy is reduced to science, and in the process there disappears that fine Platonic glow of devotion and enthusiasm which forms no inconsiderable element in the preparation of Christianity. The Aristotelian God may be an object of reverence, but between Him and man there can be no mutual fellowship, and thus no adequate provision is made for the religious needs of the race. Recognizing that we should thus be left without any principle of moral self-determination and action, Aristotle makes room in his system for practical science, or the sphere of things in which we are choosers and actors, and not simply onlookers. The moral virtues, it is urged, are produced by the habitual practice of right actions. Virtue is "that habit which is such, in relation to pleasures and pains, as to effect the best results, and vice the contrary." And here comes in Aristotle's famous doctrine of the Mean. Virtue or moral excellence is an acquired habit of feeling or acting so as to avoid either excess or defect. He who feels or does neither too much nor too little, but actually hits the mark, achieves the



mean, and goes right. Both excess and defect are characteristic of vice, but "the mean state" belongs to virtue alone. By the application of this principle it is shewn how the several virtues are "mean" states: truthfulness, *e.g.*, is the mean between exaggeration and dissimulation; liberality, the mean between prodigality and stinginess; and so on. Man, then, is a free agent, and virtue within our own power, yet it is hard in each instance to find the mean. To do so we must combine exact thinking with common sense, and act in accordance with practical wisdom (*φρονήσις*). This, however, is only partly moral; it is also partly intellectual, and is discussed by Aristotle chiefly as a perfection of the intellectual part of the soul, with little or no indication of how it operates as the moral standard for the guidance of individual conduct. In spite of its professed object of defining "the right law" for the determination of the mean, the real theme of the Sixth Book of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is the intellectual virtues. Yet a clear contrast is drawn between the practical wisdom which reveals itself in a virtuous life (*φρονήσις*), and the contemplative wisdom of pure reason (*σοφία*), with which the highest happiness is identified. Dearest to the gods, because likeliest to them, is the sage who exercises the highest faculty and cultivates pure intellect. Above all else, philosophy confers that happiness in which lies the Chief Good, the real End of man. But although for human nature the way to happiness is that of contemplative speculation, a certain degree of external prosperity and proper State organization are also necessary in order to its practical attainment. Hence the individual must learn the art of Legislation. Aristotle's is a civic philosophy.

Partly owing to the dominating influence of Plato, and partly to that of undue deference to the traditional wisdom of old-world sages, Aristotle failed to reach the standpoint of modern science, which, however, has

certainly inherited his spirit. If Plato made philosophy a religion, Aristotle turned it into a science. Broadly speaking, the one is the exponent of religion and the other of morals.

(d) *Later philosophical developments.*—(i) *The Cynics.*—The first of the Cynics was Antisthenes, a pupil of Socrates, who set up his school about B.C. 400 in a gymnasium for unenfranchized bastards. His most celebrated adherent was Diogenes, who, like St. Francis, practised rigid asceticism, and had no dwelling-place to shelter him. Even Alexander of Macedon was impressed with his sturdy independence. Later on it became usual for the Cynic to dress like a beggar, to possess nothing but a wallet and a staff, and to deliver his message in the streets. Aiming at a "direct relation of the soul to God," the Cynics proclaimed as their main doctrine the supreme worth of virtue and the worthlessness of all beside. They scorned riches, were careless about personal appearance, and shunned all earthly comforts. Pleasure (meaning probably sensual pleasure) they regarded as an evil, and broke through all ordinary social conventions. In their determination to reduce life to its bare essentials, they despised learning, literature, and art. They had no use for knowledge, or pelf, or citizenship; all they counted necessary was fidelity to the Master of the universe, and this lay in courage, temperance, justice, and wisdom. Although the term Cynicism has changed its meaning, its original connotation has not been wholly lost.

(ii) *The Stoics and Epicureans.*—The Stoic school was founded by Zeno, an emigrant to Athens from Citium in Cyprus, about B.C. 320. It took its name from the Stoa (στοά) where he lectured. "A Carlyle in concentration," he was succeeded by Cleanthes, whom Paul quotes in his speech on Mars Hill, and afterwards by Chrysippus of Soli, who as "the second founder" of Stoicism developed the system to great

completeness, and adapted it to the temper of the times.

By the fourth century B.C. the two former props of Greek life, the city and the traditional religion, had both fallen. For a progressive people the one was felt to be too narrow, and the power of the other was uprooted by the conquests of Alexander. Zeno was faced by two great questions—those of creed and conduct. To the problem, "What ought we to believe?" he had no satisfactory answer. In opposition, however, to those who denied the possibility of knowledge, he asserted the existence of the material world, as proved by the evidence of our senses, and refused to dissolve God into an abstract idea: God, the soul, and every outward object were real matter. The Stoic system was thus based upon a pantheistic materialism, yet so as to permit the conception of the universe as a living being, and of God as fiery ether, the finest part of matter. He is identical with Nature, Providence, Destiny, and is in short one with the world. The soul of man is in its nature corporeal, forms part of the universe, and is subject to the law of destiny.

While philosophy was divided by the Stoics into Logic, Natural Science, and Ethics, the main emphasis was placed upon Ethics. As a practical philosophy its real concern is with the moral conduct of men. By way of solving the problem of how to live the Stoics laid down two main propositions, (1) that virtue consists in living according to Nature or Reason, that is, in harmony with *φύσις*, the general nature of the universe, in her effort towards perfection, (2) that all things have been predetermined by the sovereign Reason, and happen according to the divine order.

Starting from the abstract position that the highest good consists in conforming to nature and reason, the Stoics maintain that man's happiness is bound up with virtuous conduct. Only virtue is a good, and only

vice is an evil. Nothing matters except what a man himself is. The Stoic ethics is not founded upon any metaphysical theory, but upon the practical ideal of the wise man as delineated by Socrates. From this standpoint the happiness of the wise lies in self-control, in imperturbable serenity of mind, in living without anxiety or fear. Every rational being owes obedience to the law of right, which is identified with the law of nature—the great chain of causation which shapes all things towards their end. The Stoics asserted the supremacy of reason over the passions, and demanded that all emotions and impulses, as contradictory to reason, should be rooted out. In their view virtue is free from emotions, and is simply properly ordered reason. They regard the whole human race as comprising but two classes—the wise and the foolish. Only the wise are free, beautiful, and rich ; only they are kings and generals, orators and poets ; only they are perfectly happy. The foolish man, on the contrary, is destitute of true knowledge, can do nothing aright, is wholly impious, and indeed mad. The mass of mankind belong to the category of the foolish ; the virtuous man is a *rara avis* who, in his closing days, and after much effort, is victorious in the struggle.<sup>1</sup> A change from folly to wisdom is possible, but takes place so suddenly that the newly wise reaches the consciousness of his condition only through later experience.

This ethical theory of the Stoics had one great difficulty to meet, namely, how would it work ? How was it to be made to square with the actual facts and conditions of life ? In what respect did it leave the individual a personality when he was reduced to the position of being merely a part of the machinery of universal law ? The Stoics were thus obliged to modify their abstract

<sup>1</sup> In this connexion it was usual to point to Socrates, Diogenes, and Antisthenes, but even these were not represented as entirely virtuous. Seneca in particular asserted the universal depravity of man.

theory of the good and evil to the extent of substituting for the proposition that the good consists in uniformity to nature the refinement that it consists in the rational choice of what is according to nature. Certain things, *e.g.* mental ability and bodily health, were pronounced desirable; other things, the reverse of these, things to be shunned. To these two classes they added a third, namely, that of things morally indifferent, such as the question whether the number of hairs on one's head is even or odd. This classification necessarily led to the application of the term "good" to things preferential, and even to the admission of many things indifferent to the category of the highest good, so that the attempt to adapt their principles to the general spirit of the times involved them in the expression of opinions out of keeping with the elemental theories of the founders of the sect. Through the formulations of new distinctions the sharp dualism of the system was gradually toned down. The conception of duty was regarded as embracing not only what is good, but also what is desirable, and in this way was made to include things differing widely in moral quality. Certain feelings, as distinguished from emotions, were represented as permissible. In the absence of concrete examples the wise man, too, was little more than a plaything of the imagination. Even if ever perfectly realized, virtue was admitted by Chrysippus to be defectible. In his opinion only the souls of the wise will survive till the end of the world and be merged into the primary substance. Some Stoics, including apparently Zeno himself, held, however, that the virtuous life will end in perfection, that thenceforth there will be no retrogression, and that ultimately the whole world will be united with the divine soul—a Fire in which every particle of man's corruptible nature will be consumed. An endless succession of new world-processes will ensue, undergo a similar course, and reach the same end. Such a con-

ception seems hard to reconcile with the Stoic claim that purposeful Reason rules the universe.

If Stoic dogmatism was philosophically inferior to Platonism, this was necessitated by the widespread demand for a practical rule of life ; but in various other respects Stoic doctrines have not escaped criticism. Not without justification Stoicism has been charged with taking too little account of the subconscious element in thought and action. Viewing life as a series of detached mental acts, it failed to see it whole, as a continuous succession of fresh experiences. Again, as Bevan remarks : " There is obviously some difficulty in fitting any scheme of action to the Stoic doctrine of salvation by acquiescence. For if I am not to be troubled by the actions of other men because everything that happens is determined by the sovereign Reason to promote its Divine Plan, then it is hard to see why I need take thought for my own action." <sup>1</sup> Yet, in fact, Stoicism only made Reason the arbiter as to whether a particular line of conduct should be followed or not, and asserted the freedom of the will alongside the reign of a universal law. It was the contention of the Stoics that at least part of a man's experience was under the control of his own will, and that living in harmony with the divine will instead of striving against it was the secret of peace for the individual man. Further, on the Stoic assumption—which, however, it shares with other religious and philosophical systems—of what Bevan aptly terms " a Friend behind phenomena," it has been objected that the happiness of the individual becomes a very secondary consideration. The only thing that matters is the good ; but to say this is to speak merely in general terms. If it be asked when is our conduct reasonable and identical with the good, the Stoic answers : when it accords with the divine law of eternal reason, when the intention is a worthy

<sup>1</sup> *Stoics and Sceptics*, p. 53.

one, and carried out in submission to the rule of providence and in resignation to the general course of the universe. To be actuated by such a ruling principle is to possess all good. Upon the precise nature of this good, however, Stoicism makes no pronouncement, in this respect presenting a marked contrast to Christianity, which teaches that Love is the great end towards which the Purpose governing the universe steadily moves. Yet, after all, this Stoic conviction that "man is not quite alone in the universe" is part of the instinctive yearning of the human mind. Still another point in regard to which the Stoic philosophy is open to criticism is its teaching on social service. While it commends benevolence as eminently befitting the wise man, this has to stop short of heartfelt sympathy or love. Service and sacrifice on behalf of his fellow-man it enjoins as duty, but whether his efforts are successful or not must, for him, be a matter of no concern. Enough that he has done what he could; there must be no inroad upon his own tranquillity. From the Christian standpoint this is a crucial blot upon the ethical creed of Stoicism. The ideal of detachment and of the preservation at all costs of inner calm is irreconcilable with the ideal of love. Under the Stoic system love and pity had no place, nor could the Nazarene ever take rank under its category of the "wise." On the whole it has to be said that, while not without serious defects in relation to both philosophy and religion, Stoicism was characterized by features of signal worth. It armed men against evil; it fostered a brave and courageous spirit in face of life's difficulties and trials; its stern discipline nerved its adherents to endure; it taught the providence of God and the brotherhood of man; it made duty the paramount concern of life; and in many respects prepared the Roman Empire for Christianity.

Stoicism was developed in a speculative direction by the adoption of the views of Heraclitus on natural

science, and also by the school of Euclides of Megara (c. B.C. 400), which was characterized by its fondness for sophistical subtleties, and by its combination of the Socratic method with Eleatic theories. The Megarians laid great stress upon logical accuracy, and busied themselves in particular with the exposure of fallacies and the puzzles of the *Sorites* ("the heap"). Prominent members of this school were Diodorus, who denied that there were any "things possible" apart from actual facts past or future, and Stilpo (c. B.C. 320), who opposed Plato's theory of ideas, and was the highly popular teacher of Zeno, the founder of Stoicism.

Among post-Aristotelian philosophers was Posidonius of Apamea (B.C. 135-51), who, while basing his philosophical ideas upon Stoicism, sought to incorporate with them a mass of popular beliefs prevalent in the Greek world of his time. By excluding the passions from the reason, and by recognizing a godless element in the soul, he deviated in one important particular from the Stoic creed and adopted the standpoint of Platonism, as afterwards did Paul. He appears to have given a good deal of attention to divination and astrology, and repudiated the idea of a hell other than that experienced on earth by the impure. His sympathies were distinctly eclectic.<sup>1</sup>

At first a Greek, the Stoic afterwards became a Roman. Primarily, on the Greek side, he had been concerned with philosophy; on the Roman his main quest was a way of life, a mode of discipline. Stoicism found an interpreter to the Roman world in Panætius of Rhodes (B.C. 189-109), who stamped it with a more eclectic character than it had previously borne, and who ultimately became principal of the school at Athens. No other Greek philosophical school so strongly appealed to the Roman cast of mind as that of Stoicism, which, besides Posidonius, counts among its younger adherents

<sup>1</sup> See ch. iii. of Bevan's *Stoics and Sceptics*.



such great names as those of Seneca (B.C. 4–A.D. 65), philosopher, politician, bookman, and writer, who set himself “to shew the right way to others” (*Ep.* 8, 1–3) by expounding Stoicism on its practical side, yet disclaimed being himself a “wise man”; Seneca’s contemporary, Musonius, who detached ethics from philosophical theory, and was reckoned as almost “a third founder of the school”; Epictetus, the pupil of Musonius, and a slave from Phrygia, whose conversations, preserved by his student Arrian, shew that his teaching was akin to that of the Cynics; and the emperor Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 121–180), who, while rejecting much of the Stoic doctrine, held that the entire cosmos is a unity governed by a foreseeing providence, advocated firmness of character, as the highest good, and was uncompromising towards “heretics.” Seeing that he was no believer in immortality, it is not perhaps surprising that a vein of melancholy runs through his writings.

Epicurus (B.C. 342–270) established his garden at Athens as a rival school to Stoicism (c. B.C. 306). In his metaphysical theory he was a materialist, and partly adopted the atomism of Democritus. Like the Stoics, however, he subordinated metaphysics to ethics. Although his conception of life was hedonistic, he was personally a most virtuous man, to whom the usual meaning attached to the epithet “Epicurean” is inapplicable. For him pleasure was a natural good sought by every living creature; it was, indeed, the highest good, not as connoting sensual enjoyments, but only in the sense of freedom from bodily want and pain and from mental perturbation. He counselled the abandonment of any pleasure that would involve a greater corresponding pain. Without countenancing Stoic insensibility, he taught that where there is intelligence external misfortunes need give no trouble, and that even torture cannot annul the happiness of the wise man. What

really makes him happy, however, is not virtue in itself, but the pleasure resulting from its practice. Such pleasure, albeit indirectly, induces that mental tranquillity which arises from self-control and simplicity of life, and which, combined with the absence of bodily pain, constitutes the ideal state of human existence. The wise man is not emotionless, as the Stoics asserted, but such emotions as he may entertain will not interfere with philosophic pursuits. Through the attainment of such wisdom happiness is permanently secured. With a view to realizing this ideal Epicurus kept himself aloof from public life and cultivated private friendship. Learning and culture, rank and power, and the usual social conventions, he contemned as contributing nothing to human happiness. Logic and rhetoric he counted worthless, and if he attached more importance to the study of nature, this was not on account of its scientific interest, but because of its practical use in freeing men from superstition. Epicurus based his view of knowledge and of life on sensation. Implicitly believing in sense-impressions, he referred everything to the feeling of pleasure and pain, and held that there was no purpose in the arrangements of nature. Epicurean ethics was based on the natural science of Democritus with its doctrine of atom-pictures, and viewed everything that exists as consisting of body and empty space. The Hebrew psalmist's belief that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy-work," was altogether alien to Epicurus. In particular, he refused to ascribe life and reason to the stars, and naïvely asserted that the heavenly bodies are only a little larger than they appear to be. He viewed the soul as a body composed of the finest atoms and incapable of existing after physical death, its arms being dispersed on its severance from the body. With the Stoics he maintained the freedom of the will, but without careful psychological inquiry either as to the nature of

the will or the conception of freedom. Religion he explained by natural growth analogous to the progressive development of the human race on the course of history. Holding it to be based upon Fear, he assailed the popular faith, and likewise the Stoic belief in Providence. Yet he not only conceded the existence of gods, but even attributed to them difference of sex. They were represented by him as a higher order of human beings dwelling in the space between the worlds, enjoying unalloyed happiness, possessing immortality, not subject to sleep, and unconcerned about the world. Such gods, the Epicureans alleged, need not be feared. While as the champions of free thought, their attitude towards the national religion was non-committal, they did not refuse to join in its ritual. If there were many points of divergence between Stoicism and Epicureanism, they had also much in common. Both were systems of practical philosophy, and gave prominence to ethics; both were concerned with happiness, and by different ways reached the same conclusion, namely, that this can be attained only through spiritual independence of outward things, absolute lordship within the realm of thought, and perfect mental repose. The service rendered by Epicureanism lay principally in its protest against fatalism, its war against superstition, and its effort to rescue men from the fear of the gods and the dread of what might follow after death. But it taught a hopeless creed: it was a philosophy for this life only. The yearning for immortality it held to be the outcome of man's pride, and the only consolation it offered in view of death was that, as it happens to all, and means the cessation of every experience of evil, it should be met with resignation. According to Epicurus men are as little affected by what follows as by what preceded their existence, and should even find in his teaching an incentive to duty, seeing it removes the incubus of terror from the contemplation of the future.

(iii) *The Sceptics*.—The reputed founder of Scepticism was Pyrrho of Elis, whose teaching is known to us chiefly through his pupil Timon of Phlius. It seems to have been inspired by distaste for the wranglings of the rival philosophical schools. Like the stoics and Epicureans, the Sceptics attached supreme value to inward calm (*ἀταραξία*), but differed from these philosophers as to the means of attaining it. Instead of making any dogmatic pronouncements, they held that since we know nothing concerning the nature of external things the only way to be happy is to maintain perfect neutrality of mind—to withhold judgement, refrain from dogmatism, and eliminate all desire for definite belief. Their attitude was thus one of pure indifference. Although they regarded probability and custom as the only guides of conduct, they latterly modified their view about the impossibility of knowledge to the extent of admitting degrees of probability. The spirit of the school was reflected in the New Academy, of which the president was Arcesilaus of Pitane (B.C. 315–240), whose chief concern was to keep alive the practice of argumentative discussion. Maintaining that nothing could ever be certainly known, he rejected the Stoic doctrine of the reality of sense impressions, and declared that it was even questionable whether we can be sure that we know nothing. The scepticism of Arcesilaus was continued and further developed by Carneades of Cyrene (B.C. 214–129), whose keen criticism led the Stoics to abandon much ground formerly held, and whose name is specially associated with the effort to dethrone dogmatic pretensions to certain knowledge in favour of a creed founded not only on probability, but on degrees of probability. There followed Ænesidemus of Cnossus and his disciples, who, under ten phases (*τρόποι*), summed up the arguments of the Sceptics, and pointed to feelings and experience as regulating the course of conduct. Still later, in the second century A.D., Lucian of Samosata taught a kind

of attenuated Stoicism, and ironically dismissed as futile the hope of ever reaching the "City" where all is bliss and peace.

And so the thinkers of the ancient world swayed between the opposite poles of dogmatism and Scepticism. The mediating theory of graduated probability was not one in which the mind could rest. A thoroughgoing scepticism to which the only certainty is "abstract personality content with itself" meant sheer inactivity, and men, feeling the need of action, demanded guidance for conduct other than mere general custom. Recognizing this, Antiochus of Ascalon (B.C. 125-50), head of the old Academy at Athens, and the teacher of Cicero, sought a standard of truth in the doctrines common to the various schools, thereby effecting the transition to Eclecticism, which in its turn led to a widespread yearning after spiritual truth and certainty that nothing short of the Christian revelation could satisfy.

(iv) *The Neo-Pythagoreans*.—The Neo-Pythagoreans, who paved the way for Neo-Platonism, based their philosophy on the metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle, and for their ethics were largely indebted to the Stoics. According to them knowledge is not an end in itself, and philosophy is but the handmaid to religion. Far from regarding sense and reason as the sole sources of knowledge, they propounded a doctrine of revelation as the key to truth, and laid stress not upon natural science, but upon man's religious needs. They held a lofty conception of God as the creator and intelligent soul of the material world, to whom the individual man is essentially akin; taught the immortality of the soul as divine and unbegotten, and viewed philosophy as the means of delivering it from imprisonment within the body; and stood for a strict morality. They rejected bloody sacrifices, and enjoined abstinence from animal food.

(v) *The Philosophy of Philo*.—Philo, the Jewish Hellenist of Alexandria (born c. B.C. 20), devoted his rare

intellectual powers to the task of combining Jewish theology with Greek speculation. Starting from the position that every philosophical truth has been derived from the Hebrew religion, and that Moses is at once "the highest saint" and the greatest of all philosophers, he represents Greek thought as a constituent element in the fullest knowledge of God, which is attainable only through ascetic contemplation. In this endeavour to bring about an understanding between the Jew and the Greek his favourite instrument is the allegorical interpretation of the Pentateuch, and by this means he finds proof in Scripture for the Platonic ideas and other philosophical tenets. Philo believes in the personality and absolute blessedness of God who is, however, without qualities, and at an infinite distance from the material world, with which He can have no contact, and which has its origin in a second principle—matter—alongside of Him. As intermediaries between God and the world, Philo posits a host of divine ideas, the highest of which is the Logos or "the second God."<sup>1</sup> These powers are inconsistently represented sometimes as integral parts of the divine essence, and at other times as distinct personalities—a vacillation arising from the twofold conception of the Logos as at once the personal manifestation of God and the operative Reason of the world. In this, as in other instances, the Jewish and Hellenistic strains in Philo's psychology came into collision. The Logos doctrine is, however, the central feature in Philo's system. His proposition is that the Logos bears to God the assurance that the human race never quite fell away from Him, and also gives the assurance to man that he never will be forsaken by God.<sup>2</sup> In his action upon the

<sup>1</sup> *Quis rer. div. hæc.* 509.

<sup>2</sup> Although so far as documentary evidence goes Philo was the first to propagate the Logos doctrine, it is possible that the idea may have found previous expression in certain of the numerous works known to have been deliberately destroyed.

soul of man the Logos is practically identical with the Wisdom (*σοφία*) of the later Biblical writings. Philo's doctrine of man reflects the Platonic dualism. The mortal body is the prison of the soul and the seat of evil, which consists in sensuality. Only by subjection to the divine element of reason, the extinction of the passions, and the exercise of faith in the mercy of God, can the soul effect its release and arrive at its true goal in the self-unconscious, mystic, ecstatic vision of God.

(vi) *The Neoplatonists*.—In Neoplatonism, which took its rise in Alexandria towards the end of the second century A.D., the speculation of Philo underwent further development. Although its origin is ascribed to Ammonius Saccas (A.D. 243), its real founder was the Egyptian Plotinus (c. 205–270). He appears to have been of Roman descent, and his works are known to us through his pupil Porphyry. Neoplatonism is a combination of Platonic doctrine with Oriental mysticism. Still more strongly than Philo, Plotinus emphasizes the transcendence of the Deity, whom he conceives as pure abstract Thought, knowable only through intuition. To him the external world is merely the effluence of the supremè Unity or unconditioned One, like that of heat from a fire. The inferior orders of existence are represented as a kind of emanation from the divine fulness. According to Plotinus man's ultimate end is absorption in the divine to the extent of losing conscious thought.<sup>1</sup> In thus raising himself above the world of sense and time to mystic rest in God, he must depend not on the practice of asceticism, but on purification of the spirit by cutting himself adrift from all material interests. By its conception of God on pure immortal spirit, by the stress

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dante :

Me such ecstasy  
O'ercame, that never till that hour was thine  
That held me in so sweet imprisonment.

(*Paradiso*, xiv. 119 ff.)

which it laid upon the kinship of the human soul to God, and by its rejection of both pagan naturalism and Jewish particularism, this latest phase of Greek philosophy must rank as a positive preparation for Christianity. If it left the soul sunk in ecstatic unconsciousness, it asserted the freedom of human personality, overcame dualism by removing the barrier between the finite and the infinite, and called forth a deep sense of the need of redemption. "This Neoplatonic swan-song of Greek philosophy is specially remarkable for its abandonment of the attempt to make good religion through philosophy."<sup>1</sup>

If it be asked what is the relevance of a discussion of Greek philosophy to the subject in hand, the answer is that in considering the wide range of reality room must be made for the alignment of Christian doctrine with philosophical thought. The apostles were not indeed concerned with speculations about the origin and nature either of the world or man. They accepted the Biblical pronouncement that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" and "made man in His own image." But these were themes canvassed from various points of view by the philosophers of Greece also, and though the speculations of the early natural philosophers were mostly limited to the material universe, their successors devoted themselves largely to the realm of mind. And it has to be recognized that true realism embraces both fields of inquiry.

## 2. PAGANISM AS REPRESENTED BY ROMAN RELIGION

To pass from the domain of Greek to that of Roman religion is to exchange the exquisite flavour of Hellenic

<sup>1</sup> Pfeiderer, *op. cit.* p. 56. See further on Plotinus, *Jesus and the Greeks*, p. 199 ff., and especially W. R. Inge, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*.

<sup>2</sup> For a fuller treatment of Philo, see the present writer's *Jesus and the Greeks*, pp. 161-216, and *The Background of the Gospels*, pp. 349-361; also in particular *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, by H. A. A. Kennedy.



thought for the ceremonial matter-of-fact observances of an imperial and meticulously regulated State cult.

The Romans practised a form of Animism or nature-worship. Their gods are not real persons, but only *numinæ*, or "powers" residing in sacred places or objects. These divine manifestations came to be so numerous that Petronius, a writer belonging to the imperial age, makes one of his characters say : " Our country is so populated with deities that it is much easier to find a god in it than a man " (*Sat.* 17). This state of things was the result of the nervous fear which led the Romans to seek for a bodyguard of deities, so to speak, to protect them at every moment and under all circumstances. Only one thing prevented the religious idea from dominating Roman life. This was the political instinct, which has never been so strongly implanted in any people. We see the climax of this tendency in the cult of the *dea Roma*, the personified majesty of the city, and in the deification of the reigning emperor from the time of Julius Cæsar onwards. In the provinces especially Cæsar-worship attained wide popularity. The Romans, then, attached paramount importance to the rights of the State. To these everything else, even the most cherished customs and sentiments, were promptly subordinated. For example, clearly as they liked to bury their dead within their houses, believing that thus they would enjoy divine protection, they at once renounced the practice upon a law being passed against it ; and great as were a father's powers in relation to his children, he had to yield obedience to his son should the latter be installed in any public office. Livy (*Hist.* xxiv. 44) tells us that in such a case the father must even dismount before the son, should the two happen to meet by the way. In these circumstances it is not surprising that religion itself had to come under the same yoke. The civil power was supreme. What especially contributed to this was the fact that the civil and the religious authority were both

vested in the same persons. There was no priestly caste, no theocratic element; praetors or consuls acted as augurs or pontiffs also. To have served the country in her councils or in her wars was sufficient qualification for office, whether secular or sacred. No feuds arose between the civil and religious powers. The same cold practical spirit that ruled secular matters was applied to those of religion. Its affairs were in the hands not of theologians, but of politicians—a situation which the Nazi government is seeking to reproduce in Germany to-day. And thus it came about that among the Romans religion was purely a matter of *cultus*. It meant sacrifices and ceremonies, but not dogma. In no respect was it a theology, and it was little influenced by moral truth. The legal element was the dominating one, and this fact carried with it its own limitations. While law can control actions, it cannot control thought. But if thought was free, there was a rigorous insistence upon the due performance of ancient rites. Not one of the numerous ceremonial details could be with safety omitted. In all enactments, civil and sacred, regard was had to the form rather than the principle, to the letter rather than the spirit. This really belonged to the genius of the Roman people. So extremely sensitive were they about carrying out the letter of their obligations that even serious crime seemed preferable to failure in this respect. Livy relates how some rebel soldiers out of compunction for having failed to fulfil the oath they had made to their generals, thought of killing the latter in order to ease their own consciences!<sup>1</sup> Thus also in making a sacrifice the one thing thought of was exact compliance with the legal ceremonial—an idea perhaps etymologically contained in the word *religio* (=binding back). Roman piety, then,

<sup>1</sup> *Hist.* ii. 32. Cf. Goldsmith, *The Citizen of the World*, Letter xxxix: "The milliner from whom we bought . . . our ribands cheated us as if she had no conscience, and so, to quiet mine, I cheated her."

was above all a matter of outward observance and mechanical precision. No importance was attached to the frame of mind of the worshipper. The main stress was laid on correct observance of ritual and calmness of spirit. Anything of the nature of devotional feeling or mystical contemplation was quite foreign to its spirit. To appear before the Gods in fit vesture and after the prescribed form—that was the sum and substance of Roman piety.<sup>1</sup> As in Judaism, this extreme punctiliousness gave rise to special difficulties. It was no easy thing to know the proper god to approach, to give him his right name, or to use the exact formula required so as not to err either by excess or by defect. There was the further difficulty of getting the god to understand, hence the “vain repetitions” alluded to in the First Gospel as distinctive of the prayers of the heathen (Mt 6<sup>7</sup>).

We know from Polybius that public spirit and patriotism as exhibited in Rome called forth the admiration of the Greeks. That historian also subscribes to the opinion of the Romans that these virtues were in part at least the fruit of their religion. To the Greek mind it appeared nothing less than a stroke of genius to have made religion thus subserve the interests of public order, and to have successfully harnessed to the chariot of government what has too often been a disturbing and disintegrating force. Instead of being, as in Greece, a fertile source of disorder, religion was an important factor in developing those qualities which had gone to make Roman citizenship one of the most coveted of earthly possessions. The estimation in which it was held is clearly reflected in the New Testament (Ac 16<sup>38</sup>, 22<sup>29</sup>). To be a Roman citizen was to occupy a position far superior to that of a Greek or a Jew. But in Rome the man was submerged in the citizen. If the citizen increased, the man decreased. It was a great thing to be a

<sup>1</sup> “*Casta placent superis: pura cum veste venito.*”—Tibullus, ii. 1. 13.

Roman ; it was nothing to be merely a human being. The personality of the individual did not count. There was no sense of the worth of human life as such, and no disposition to assert the rights of manhood. The slave was content to be the asset of his master, the son to be the chattel of his father, the citizen to be the property of his city. All this was the outcome of a perverted sense of duty. While a man has obligations to the State, he also owes something to himself, and to his neighbour as sharing with himself the attributes of manhood. Devotion to duty was a strong, and in some respects an admirable, feature in the genuine old Roman character, but even this had its weak side. The typical representative here is Cato the censor (B.C. 234-149). He lived at a time when the power of Rome was as yet undiminished, although threatened by Hannibal's invasion, and by the still more dangerous invasion of Oriental manners and customs. Cato was a man of inflexible strength of will, whose outlook upon life was severely Puritanic. He represented the simplicity of the ancient Romans, and had no sympathy with the foreign customs which were being so widely introduced. In his capacity of censor he shewed himself hostile to all such innovations. His aim was to maintain the time-honoured discipline of Roman life and the purity of public morals. Although not always successfully, he threw the weight of his influence against every form of extravagance, enacted laws against luxury, and restrained usury with a strong hand. In all this he proved himself a fearless citizen. Yet he was far from being an ideal man. Not that his view of life as essentially a discipline was in itself wrong, or that his strictly methodical habits were anything but helpful to himself. But his treatment of his family and dependents was inexcusably rigorous. He was a harsh husband, an austere father, a cruel master. He often castigated his slaves for very trifling faults, and turned them adrift when they grew old. Thus even at

the last the old Roman character had its defects. Its virtues were many, including patriotism, veracity, temperance, valour, respect for authority ; but it was never nourished on the milk of human kindness. There ran through the empire a vein of relentless cruelty. Roman religion meant exactitude, regularity, discipline, and so formed an excellent training-school of citizens, but it knew nothing of generous sympathy or glad enthusiasm, or anything approaching " the tie that binds our hearts in Christian love."

We have already taken note of the fact that the Roman State was fast drifting into moral bankruptcy. In religion also, under the Republic, there set in a change for the worse. This was largely due to the silent importation of the Greek mythology. Even the aristocratic party, who were conservative of national traditions, began to attach less importance to the " auspices " so closely identified with Roman religion. They were readers of Greek literature, and had developed a taste for Greek art. Religion was openly scouted in the theatres, alike in the comedies of Plautus and in the tragedies of Ennius. At first directed against the less moral divinities of Greece, these liberties soon came to be taken with the gods of Rome also. Already in Cato's time two augurs could not meet without laughing, and subsequently, in spite of the efforts of politicians to arrest the process, faith in the old religion steadily decayed until multitudes were disposed to welcome some new form of belief. The old rites had lost their significance, and were only mechanically performed. Cicero had no belief in divination, yet he diligently fulfilled his duties as an augur, considering it to be for the public advantage that the delusion should be kept up. The practice, it was said, often restrained the deliberative assemblies from acts of folly. But nothing could obscure the fact that Græco-Roman paganism had fallen into a moribund condition, and had become a soulless comedy. There was

an unwholesome divorce between profession and belief. Many who professed the ancient religion in public denied it in private ; many who defended it as citizens assailed it as men. There were still, doubtless, sincere adherents of the *religio civilis*. Milo made a vow before killing Clodius, and duly paid it after the deed was done. But on the whole the ancient faith was being rapidly undermined, and little wonder. It had no message for the soul. It did not encourage meditative devotion.<sup>1</sup> At most it was a matter of ritual, a form without power. From the picture of polite society drawn in Cicero's letters religious life in any real sense is entirely absent ; the atmosphere is one of indifference. Roman religion had degenerated into an empty formalism which could not last, and in point of fact the meaningless rites soon fell into desuetude. Moral bankruptcy became spiritual also, and the temples became ruins.

In such circumstances some substitute had to be found to which men could have recourse in sore straits or sudden emergencies. This seemed to be supplied by those mysterious Oriental cults which were gradually becoming better known. The Delphic oracles were forsaken in favour of Chaldaean astrologers.<sup>2</sup> By the latter half of the third century B.C. Greece had grown familiar with Egyptian worships. In the succeeding century these began to take root in Rome also. Although at first frowned upon by the authorities, they were latterly supported by the most powerful in the State. In B.C. 43 the triumvirs themselves erected a temple to Isis and Serapis.<sup>3</sup> The Syrian sun-god, and latterly the Persian Mithras, had also many devotees. The impression, however, was gaining ground that these were only

<sup>1</sup> The author of *Marius the Epicurean* characterizes the Roman religion as " a religion which had been always something to be done rather than something to be thought, believed, or lived."—Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero, *De div.* i. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Dio Cass. xlvii. 15.

different names for the one supreme God, and it is noteworthy that all these cults made some provision for dealing with the fact of sin. In this way they helped to rescue the Romans from gross materialism, and to keep them in touch with the world unseen which cannot be subjugated by the sword. Realizing that the old paganism was now an empty shell, the best of the Romans could only cling to the notion, inborn in the human heart, that there is a personal Power above who rules our destinies. Many thoughtful men were influenced in the same direction by Judaism, which had become a spiritual force throughout the empire. Others, attracted by Stoicism, were so driven in upon their own personality by the introspective trend of that philosophical system that they, too, were yearning for deliverance from evil. Their attitude was akin to that of the unburied dead whose eagerness to be ferried across the Styx is so beautifully described in the poetic representation of Vergil (*Æn.* vi. 314) :

Tendebantque manus ripæ ulterioris amore.

### 3. PAGANISM AS REPRESENTED BY THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS

One of the leading features in the religious syncretism which for several centuries before and after the commencement of the Christian era marked the Græco-Roman world is that connected with what are known as the Mystery Religions. These were of a very varied character, and in one form or another permeated the entire region of the Mediterranean as well as the countries to the east of the Euphrates. While clearly distinctive in their origin, and emanating some from Greece, and some from Egypt, Phrygia, Syria, Persia, and other countries, they had certain features in common. In several quarters, for example, it was customary for the initiates to meet for worship ; they were also united in a brotherly fellowship in communion with the particular

deity and for purposes of mutual aid ; lifelong self-denial was obligatory. As, however, men were attracted to the Mysteries from a variety of motives, they included the most diverse types of religious votaries ; and neither in point of beliefs nor of ritual was there anything like strict uniformity. There could not be, for while some of these cults harboured the grossest materialism, in others earnest men aspired to the heights of ecstatic vision associated with Neoplatonic thought.

A recent writer estimates a Mystery Religion as " a system of religious symbolism, a gnosis, a religion of redemption, an eschatological religion, primarily a personal religion, and a cosmic religion." <sup>1</sup> Subjoined are a few particulars regarding some of the principal cults embraced in this category.

(I) *The Eleusinian Mysteries*.—The temple of Demeter at Eleusis in Attica was the scene of these celebrated Greek Mysteries, in which the devotee associated himself with the trials of the goddess in her quest for the lost Persephone. At the annual celebrations these were dramatically represented in the form of a passion play. Only the initiated, clothed in white, could share in the rites. Not until after undergoing certain purifications and a preliminary admission to the Lesser Mysteries at Athens, and receiving the title of *Mystæ*, could candidates at a considerable interval present themselves at Eleusis for complete initiation by baptism. Words of exhortation, based perhaps on the significance of the mystic programme enacted, were followed by the sacred vision (*ἐποπτεία*) which raised them to the rank of *εποπταῖ*. It was also given them to handle things reckoned peculiarly holy. That the secret ritual was

<sup>1</sup> Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, ch. ii. E. Bevan reckons the chief marks of the Mystery Religions to have been these :

- (1) They were voluntary associations entered by personal choice ;
- (2) They recognized no distinction of birth or class ;
- (3) They practised a secret ritual.



deemed as magically effecting the mystical union with the divine is apparent from the formula preserved by Clement (*Protrep.* ch. ii.): "I fasted, I drank the cup, I took out of the chest; having done the act, I put again into the basket and from the basket again into the chest." Not, however, (as Foucart holds) that the object of the Mysteries was to furnish initiates with magical formulæ for exorcizing the dangers that beset the soul on the way to the next world.<sup>1</sup> In the Eleusinian, as in most of the other mysteries (the Orphic and Hermatic excepted), the main emphasis was placed not upon doctrine, but upon symbolism, the handling of things sacred, and intensity of emotion. "To understand the quality and intensity of the impression, we should borrow something from the modern experiences of Christian Communion Service, Mass, and Passion Play, and bear in mind also the extraordinary susceptibility of the Greek mind to an artistically impressive pageant."<sup>2</sup>

At first these mysteries were merely a local harvest festival, but ultimately developed into a pan-Hellenic religious cult described by Aristides as even "a common sanctuary of the whole world."<sup>3</sup> Confirmatory of this is the statement of Boissier that an Indian ambassador to Augustus "surprised nobody when on passing he made himself be initiated at Eleusis."<sup>4</sup> In the matter of religious practice differences of detail between the various religions had come to be held of little account.

Initiation was viewed as "a spiritual begetting" conferring regeneration, the forgiveness of sins, and the assurance of immortality. According to an inscription found at Eleusis, a hierophant named Glaucus exclaims: "Beautiful indeed is the mystery given us by the blessed

<sup>1</sup> See Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> Art. "Mystery," *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., xix. p. 121<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *Eleus.*, Dindorf, p. 415.

<sup>4</sup> *La Rel. Rom.*, i. p. 341.

gods ; death is for mortals no longer an evil but a blessing." Similarly the scholiast on Aristophanes (*Frogs*, 158) declares : " It was the common belief in Athens that whoever had been taught the Mysteries would, when he died, be deemed worthy of divine glory." By means of initiation a sharp line was thus drawn between the saved and the unsaved. While the uninitiated die without hope, it is affirmed by the goddess-mother in the *Hymn to Demeter* that " happy is he of men on earth who has seen those mysteries." All such were assured of reward in the future.

(2) *The Phrygian Cult of the Great Mother Cybele (with Attis)*.—The worship of Cybele came to be fused with that of the Phrygian god Sabazios. Its central feature was the myth of Attis, a shepherd who, in contrition for his violation of his vow to the goddess that he would always live in celibacy, mutilated himself under a pine tree, thenceforward deemed sacred to the Great Mother. After his death he was deified ; temples were erected to his memory ; and he was invoked as " Attis the Most High and Bond of the Universe." The bewailing of her lover and his resurrection to immortal life formed the pivots of the dramatic celebration at the annual spring festival of Cybele. The sacred pine tree was cut down, swathed like a corpse, and borne into the sanctuary with garlands, religious symbols, and a statue of the god. Following an interval of abstinence came *the day of blood* and the burial of the tree, while the *Mystæ* in delirious dances gashed themselves with knives to shew their sorrowful sympathy with the god. Next night they celebrated the resurrection of Attis. The grave was opened and illumined, and the priest, anointing the lips of the initiates with holy oil, conveyed the comforting message : " Be of good cheer, ye *mystæ* of the god who has been saved : there will also be for you salvation from your trials." The worshippers then manifested their joy in a wild carnival of Corybantic

dances, masquerading, and ritualistic ceremonies. A mystic formula akin to the Eleusinian already quoted has been transmitted by Clement of Alexandria: "I ate out of the timbrel; I drank from the cymbal; I carried the dish (*κερνός*); I entered the chamber."<sup>1</sup> Although this language is suggestive of a sacramental meal through which those who partook of it were brought into communion with the god, it is not possible to assign to it a definite date, and it must not therefore be taken as proving that a mystic belief in immortality prevailed at or shortly after the beginning of the Christian era. The Cybele-Attis cult was indeed, as Kennedy remarks, a "barbaric ritual," but, as he adds, "it indicates a yearning for a real salvation." We may believe that some at least of the initiates could testify to a genuine experience in their ancient liturgical utterance: "I fled from evil, I found what is better."<sup>2</sup>

(3) *The Egyptian Isis*.—The myth tells how, after the murder and dismemberment of Osiris by his brother Tryphon, his consort Isis discovered his mangled members, except a single part which had been thrown into the sea. Having avenged her husband's death, she distributed wax statues containing sections of his body among the priests of the several deities within her kingdom, and exacted an oath that they would shew their appreciation of this favour by installing a form of worship in which divine honours would be accorded to their mutilated prince and consolation provided "for men and women who should fall into like misfortunes."<sup>3</sup> At Philæ his body is depicted with sprouting corn and an inscription: "This is the form of him whom one may not name, Osiris of the mysteries, who

<sup>1</sup> *Protrep.*, ch. ii. Firmicus Maternus (*De Errore Profan. Rel.* (ed. Ziegler), p. 57, 14 f.) furnishes a shorter version: "I ate out of the timbrel; I drank from the cymbal; I became an initiate of Attis."

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 95.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.*

springs from the returning waters " (of the Nile).<sup>1</sup> The Isis-Serapis worship became widely diffused. It spread to Greece in the third century B.C., and by the beginning of the first century B.C. it had established itself at Rome. Its charm has been ascribed not only to its impressive ritual, but also to its doctrine of immortality and the gracious tenderness of Isis as a *mater dolorosa*. Of the genuine devotee of Osiris an old Egyptian document asserts: "As truly as Osiris lives, shall he live: as truly as Osiris is not dead, he shall not die: as truly as Osiris is not annihilated, shall he not be annihilated."<sup>2</sup> This means that the initiate becomes Osiris.

Owing to its syncretistic appeal, and its transformation under Greek influences, the Osiris-Serapis cult was identified with the worship of a host of other deities. By way of carrying out his policy of promoting racial fusion Alexander had set up a temple of Isis alongside of one to the Hellenic deities in the city of Alexandria, and it became customary to address the goddess as "una quæ est omnia, dea Isis." Ptolemy I., adopting the policy of Alexander, introduced into his capital the cult of Serapis,<sup>3</sup> which continued to flourish until the destruction of the Serapeum in A.D. 391. Heavy demands were made upon its adherents. These included, besides the severest discipline, the provision of temples and costly robes, and the maintenance of an extensive priesthood. An ostrakon in the Museum of Berlin, of date A.D. 63, has preserved a receipt given by a priest of Isis to a workman in these terms: "I have received from you four drachmæ, one obol, as collection of Isis for the public worship."<sup>4</sup> Discipline was exercised by

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, p. 257 ff. These were regarded as proceeding from the tears shed by Isis on account of her bereavement.

<sup>2</sup> Erman, *Die ägyptische Religion*, quoted by Kennedy.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently derived from the Egyptian Osiris-Apis. The name, a compound of Osiris and Apis, was at first *Ὀσῖραπις*.

<sup>4</sup> Wilcken, *Gr. Ostraka*, ii. p. 413.

the deity through the medium of the priesthood. Juvenal (*Sat.* vi.) mentions the case of a lady penitent who appeared in the confessional at Rome, and had to offer a goose and a cake for failure to observe the prescribed abstinence. After the initial time of sorrow the worshipper rejoiced with Isis. In the festivals of the Blessing of the Vessel of Isis<sup>1</sup> and the Finding or Resurrection of Osiris—the main public celebrations of the Egyptian cult—the enthusiasm of its members found annual expression. The latter took the form of a passion play in which for ten days Osiris was sorrowfully sought; then the grief of Isis and her devotees is turned into joy, and the cry raised: "We have found him, we rejoice together." "Thus," says Minucius Felix (*Octav.* 21), "they never cease year by year to lose what they find and to find what they lose."

Much light is thrown upon the nature and purport of this Mystery Religion by the account which Apuleius gives of the initiation of the candidate Lucius. After a period of prayer and fasting, and a bath in the sacred laver, he becomes the recipient of mystic revelations. Ten days of further preparation follow; then he is ushered into the innermost shrine. The writer represents him as thus describing his ecstatic experience: "I penetrated to the boundaries of death; I trod the threshold of Prosperine, and after being borne through all the elements I returned to earth; at midnight I beheld the sun radiating white light: I came into the presence of the gods below and the gods above, and did them reverence close at hand" (*Metam.* xi. 23). As Kennedy justly remarks, "The whole picture is of extraordinary significance both for the outer and inner aspects of Hellenistic Mystery-Religion. On the one hand, there are the prescribed abstinences, the solemn baptism, the communication of mystic formulæ, and the overpowering scenes which formed the climax of

<sup>1</sup> See the description of the procession in Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 9-16.

initiation. On the other, there is presented to us the preparation of heart, the symbol of cleansing, the conception of regeneration, and finally identification with the deity."<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that there is a wonderful elevation and beauty about the sacramental prayer in which Lucius expresses his thanksgiving to the goddess after his initiation.<sup>2</sup>

(4) *The Hermetic Mystery Books*.—These represent a compound of Chaldæan, Greek, and Egyptian ideas, and reflect in large measure the syncretistic mystery cults. According to Reitzenstein,<sup>3</sup> this literature is "the evolution of ancient Egyptian ideas"; Cumont<sup>4</sup> views it as "the result of an attempt to reconcile Egyptian traditions first of all with Chaldæan astronomy, then with Greek philosophy, in the transformation of which it shared"; in the opinion of Zielinski<sup>5</sup> it exhibits a preponderance of Greek philosophical elements constituting a higher Hermetic as distinct from a lower represented by the magical strata derived from Egyptian sources. Kennedy<sup>6</sup> considers that "probably each of these theories is partially true." It is scarcely possible to disentangle the Greek from the Egyptian elements, and the problem is complicated by the fact that Oriental influences were at work. In the aggregate the Hermetic religion claims to be a revelation, and the existence of "praying societies" adhering to it in various districts of Egypt is attested by documentary evidence.

The leading notes in the Hermetic faith are those of illumination, regeneration, and deification. Hermes undertook to "preach to men the beauty of knowledge"

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> For the text of this, see Kennedy, *ib.* p. 103.

<sup>3</sup> Articles on *Hermes und die Hermetik* (in *Archiv. f. Religionswiss.*, 1905, 1906).

<sup>4</sup> *Les Religions Orientales*, p. 341.

<sup>5</sup> *Hellenistische Theologiæ in Ægypten* (*N. Jahrh. f. d. Klas. Alt.* xiii. 1904, p. 177 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 113.

(*Poim.* i. 26), and the full-blown mystic has attained to the true knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of God. The pathway to this lies through the mystery of regeneration. "No salvation without regeneration" is the declaration of Poimandres (*Corp. Herm.*). Spiritual vision of the Most High, thus reached, results in deification. According to Poimandres (i. 26), "this is the blessed end for those who have attained knowledge, to be deified."

Nowhere in the Hermetic literature are these positions more clearly set forth than in the dialogue between Hermes and his son Tat (*Poim.* xiv.). Demanding to know the secret of regeneration, Tat is informed by Hermes that the new birth is brought about in the heart of man by the will of God. Thereupon Tat sees the supersensual vision, and experiences a transition from a mortal to an immortal body. After this he rises into the Ogdoad or dwelling-place of God, and listens while his father rehearses the hymn of praise sung by the illumined on entering the higher world of the Spirit. Hermes then gathers up the meaning of the entire experience in these impressive words: "Thou hast come to a spiritual knowledge of thyself and our Father."

The Hermetic "revelation" attracted many in quest of a satisfying knowledge of God and of a redemption-religion which guaranteed salvation and immortal life. It has, however, been rightly remarked that "this Hermetic faith was too vague and pitched too high for the average man."<sup>1</sup> The idea of union with deity in a "mystery" was to be realized not through faith but through knowledge. Concerning the Hermetic mystic it is said: "to know is to believe; to disbelieve is to fail to know" (*Corp. Herm.* ix. 10). In laying the main emphasis upon knowledge rather than upon faith, Hermeticism was indeed as much an aspect of Gnosticism as a Mystery-Religion.

<sup>1</sup> Angus, *op. cit.* p. 290.

(5) *Popularity of the Mysteries and their Defects.*—Owing to the varied character of the Mysteries it is difficult to pronounce upon their moral and religious value. They were not all on the same level. In some instances they were little removed from a pretentious quackery repellent to earnest-minded pagans ; in others, such as the Eleusinia, they were of a high religious type, and a source of real comfort to anxious souls. The Mysteries were in truth a strange mixture of higher and lower elements, and characterized by marked and irreconcilable contrasts—"sensuousness and spirituality, sensuality and ascetism, magic and prayer, remnants of naturalism and symbolic mysticism, deafening music and silent contemplation, brilliant lights and deepest darkness." <sup>1</sup> Our judgement regarding them must be largely determined by the angle from which they are viewed. Unqualified censure is ruled out by the extent to which they met the deep religious yearnings of the age. On the other hand, the denunciations of early Christian apologists do suggest that they had an ugly aspect, and in particular travestied the most sacred rites of the religion of Jesus. In any case it stands to the credit of these cults that they positively affirmed the importance of the individual, the principle of religious freedom, and the truth of immortality.

The causes of the widespread popularity of the Mysteries are obvious enough both from the general conditions of the age and from the special degree in which they were calculated to satisfy its demands. Historically, the first impulse towards the Mysteries is traceable to Orphism, which led men to transfer the centre of gravity in religion from the present world to the future. It introduced the conception of sin, and stressed the necessity of atonement. Viewing man's nature as a dualistic opposition between soul and body, it found in asceticism and a sacramental ritual a means of purifying

<sup>1</sup> Angus, *op. cit.* p. 245.



the soul from the pollution of sin, and of raising it to the bliss of immunity from the remorseless cycle of re-incarnation. Although their prescriptions for wiping out defilements were of too ceremonial and magical a character, the Orphics laboured to propagate the ideal of holiness, which became more and more bound up with the evolution of Greek religion. They also filled old familiar rites with a new significance, and rendered valuable service in conserving for the future of religion the principle of union with the divine by means of ecstatic mystic contemplation. Orphism also gave a new individualistic trend to the religious life by representing salvation as a personal concern for every man, and by insisting on the necessity of divine aid in realizing the ideal of purity and consequent deification—features taken over by the Mystery cults. Subsequently the fall of the Greek city-state régime, and the fusion of races under Alexander and the Romans, sounded the knell of state-churchism, and gave an impetus to religious syncretism. Philosophically and religiously, the Western world was penetrated by influences from the East, till life, thought, and religion were to a great extent orientalized.

The spread of the Mysteries was helped also by the lure of astrology, which formed an element in the religions of the East. Among the Romans the practice of divination grew apace. By this means men hoped to obtain indications of the divine will and revelations concerning the future. An amalgam of Chaldæan priestly practice and Greek mathematical skill, astrology appealed strongly to the people of the West. It chimed in with the ecstatic mood of the Mysteries ; it raised the status of Oriental priests ; it supplanted the Delphic oracle ; it fostered the trend towards monotheism by its worship of the Sun as supreme among the celestial bodies, and it is significant that in the end Mystery-gods were identified with him. If in some directions the influence of astralism was religiously beneficial, it also wrought

much harm by its fatalistic trend and its magical practices.”<sup>1</sup>

The progress of individualism, the prevalent syncretism of the Græco-Roman world, and the development of guilds or private religious associations, were each important factors in popularizing the Mysteries. An ever-deepening sense of sin and of the necessity of reconciliation had a similar effect. In the purifying rites of mystic communions and the practice of asceticism men found relief from pessimistic despair. Their eager thirst for salvation and immortality drove them towards the Mystery Religions, which guaranteed these supreme blessings on the ground of revelation, and through the enactment of a veritable drama of redemption between the supernatural and the natural world. These religions were built, too, upon the old Orphic assumption that if man is to be saved at all, it must be by a power outside of himself. All these conditions were highly favourable to the progress of the Mystery cults.

Notwithstanding their popularity, the Mysteries had many radical defects. Among these must be reckoned (1) the rule of secrecy. By their occult origin, by confining the practice of their religious rites to the initiated, and by keeping from the knowledge of others their doctrinal beliefs, they sought artfully to inspire a sense of awe, and to lift their cults beyond the reach of ordinary human intelligence. In these ways their title of “Mysteries” was certainly earned; but while there may well be, and indeed must be, an element of mystery in the sphere of religion, no satisfactory faith can rest on the basis of the merely mysterious. True religion must appeal to what is comprehensible to the human

<sup>1</sup> See the detailed discussion by Angus (*op. cit.* ch. v.), who deals with another somewhat obscure factor affecting the growing attraction of the Mysteries, namely, that of the worship of the Earth-Spirits (Chthonians)—they were also underworld gods—with a view to securing their favour in Hades.

reason, and be based on real historical fact. In this respect the Mystery Religions resembled that of the Essenes, and differed *in toto* from Christianity, which not only permitted all and sundry to be present at any gathering in the name of Jesus, but expressly invited the whole world to listen to the gospel of His grace. (2) Emotionalism in excess, and the subordination of scientific instruction to unrestrained feeling. The main emphasis was laid not upon the perception of spiritual truth, but upon the awakening of powerful impressions, and the creation of a tense frame of mind in which the initiates experienced a shuddering awe, fell under the power of the symbolic, and by means of a mystic ritual were encouraged to let their fancy rove at will. The mind was lost in a fog, or—to change the metaphor—instead of being introduced to ordered thought, the mystic found himself adrift upon a floating bog of mythological fluidity and vagueness. Reason was no longer at the helm. At the same time the cultivation by the Mysteries of the emotional element in religion was not without its value. (3) Complicity in astrology and magic. The influence of astrology as a religious science of Eastern origin has already been referred to. If the Mysteries erred in entangling themselves with astralism, they erred still more in allying themselves to magic. The desire of Simon Magus to purchase from the Apostles the power of performing miracles (Ac 8<sup>13f.</sup>) and the burning of sorcerers' books at Ephesus in consequence of the teaching of Paul (Ac 19<sup>19</sup>), illustrate the extent to which the black art was practised in Asia Minor. Magic and the mysteries were in great demand as a means of supposed deliverance from the malice of dæmons, "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," and the rigours of Fate. So strongly, indeed, had the idea of magical efficacy through charms and spells entrenched itself in the pagan world, that many recruits won for the new faith took with them into the

Church magical notions which have left their mark both on Christian theology and worship. Yet in associating themselves with magic the Mystery Religions sustained grievous damage. They thereby lent themselves to an enervating credulity, and lost any spirituality they may have possessed. Not that for centuries was their popularity diminished. Their adherents, however, were under the thrall of fear<sup>1</sup> induced by their superstitions. It required the rise of Christianity to strike the shackles of terror from the victims of magical delusion. Besides accomplishing this, it set before men an absolutely spiritual idea of God, and also the necessity of banishing all formalism from His worship. (4) Lack of a definite theology. Since their adherents were pledged to secrecy regarding their initiatory rites and credal standpoint, the inner significance and doctrinal content of the Mysteries remained a sealed book to those beyond their pale. Initiates were indeed free to proclaim their faith by means of symbols, but as these were intelligible only to those in possession of the gnosis attached to the mystery, the outside public were none the wiser. Hence the peculiar difficulty of realizing the precise doctrinal standpoint of these ancient cults. Apparently without any proper theological basis, they absorbed a multitude of crude primitive myths, which, although essentially barbaric, and highly repugnant to "pure religion and undefiled," were nevertheless, in order to accommodate them to a more developed moral sense, vainly idealized and interpreted as symbolic of the deity and of the life of man. No claim founded on antiquity, no allegorical ingenuity, no artful and seductive symbolism, no fantastic visions graced with splendour and appalling the senses, could divest the mysteries of their real character as a collection of impalpable myths destitute of positive theological content and having no

<sup>1</sup> "The ancient world was frightened."—E. Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 81.

relation to the human reason. (5) Want of moral strength. In the Mystery Religions we meet with nothing like the morality of Judaism, *the* ethical religion of antiquity, or even the high moral standard of the Stoics. While fostering a sense of individual need, and leading the soul to aspire to union with the deity, they shewed no corresponding advance with respect to moral requirements. Improvement in conduct did not keep pace with the ardent longing for immortality. Not that there were no transformed characters among the *Mystæ*; they were indeed compelled to take on a growingly ethical tone in their outlook upon practical life. "On account of initiation," says the orator Sopatros, "I shall be quite prepared for every moral demand." The Mithras-worship especially, which began to flourish shortly after the period under review, exhibited an exceptional degree of moral strength, due probably to its connexion with the teaching of Zoroaster, which conceived the Supreme God as enthroned in truth and righteousness. Nevertheless, upon the whole the Mystery Religions were as ethically weak as they were intellectually and theologically vague. They failed to realize the indissoluble connexion between religion and morality. (6) Unwholesome asceticism. When in the course of time a rebound took place from the revolting indulgences of naturalistic religion, the pendulum swung to the other extreme of a stern and rigorous asceticism. The main ideas underlying this movement were that of a prevalent dualistic conception of human nature (as composed of two antagonistic elements, the spiritual and the physical), and that of a conviction that the deity could be appeased and sin expiated by bodily torture. From the first pre-Christian century asceticism dominated philosophy and religion in the Western world. With the exception of Jesus, "every great teacher from Plato to John the Baptist axiomatically accepted asceticism as an essential of

and qualification for the religious life.”<sup>2</sup> It took various forms and affected every department of life. By fasting, self-mutilation, gashing with knives, arduous pilgrimages, exposure to cold, and similar practices, the flesh was crucified. This highly-developed individual consciousness resulted in civic and family obligations being alike neglected. Attention was concentrated on matters relating to food and drink, sex, etc. Virginity was exalted above motherhood. To free the soul from bondage to the body became the chief aim in life. The ludicrous side of the asceticism practised by mystic devotees could not escape observation in the contemporary world. Juvenal says of a worshipper of Isis: “She will break the ice and plunge into the river in winter. Three times will she bathe in the Tiber at early dawn, and lave her tumid head in its eddies. Then she will crawl on bleeding knees, naked and shivering, over the whole length of the Campus Martius. If Io command, she will go to the extremity of Egypt, and bring back water from scorching Merœ to sprinkle in Isis’s shrine” (*Sat.* vi. 525 ff.).

#### 4. PAGANISM AS REPRESENTED BY THE PARSI RELIGION

The religion of the ancient Persians was founded by Zoroaster (Zarathushtra, Zartusht, in Persian forms of the name) possibly about the eighth century B.C. The date cannot be definitely ascertained. Early religious conditions in Iran are wrapt in obscurity. Inscriptions prove that already Darius I. recognized Ormazd as the Supreme God, and Artaxerxes I. and his successors were Zoroastrians, but it is a moot point whether the early Achæmenians professed this faith. It is known, however, to have been intimately connected with what the Greeks styled the teaching and practice of the Magi (the

<sup>1</sup> Angus, *op. cit.* p. 216 f.

"Athravans" of the Avesta and the scientists of that day), but we are without authentic information concerning the precise relation between the two religions. Both, however, were specially associated with the worship of fire. Speaking of the army of Darius, Q. Curtius (c. A.D. 64) says: "The fire which they called eternal was carried before them on silver altars; the Magi came after it singing hymns after the Persian manner; 365 youths clothed in scarlet followed them, according to the number of the days of the year." He also represents Darius as adjuring his soldiers by his "eternal fire," and the shining of the sun.<sup>1</sup> Persian religion as a whole practised also the cult of Haoma,<sup>2</sup> although the sacrificial use of the sacred juice of the yellow-flowering haoma plant (akin to the soma drink of the Indian Vedas) appears to have been banned by Zarathushtra. Besides the haoma, sacrifices of meat and drink were offered on mountain-tops, the worship consisting mainly of chants and prayers.

No authentic biography of Zoroaster exists, the section of the Avesta dealing with this having been lost. In the *Zartusht Namak* and some other products of the Pahlavi literature the information given is mainly a legendary string of marvels. Nevertheless, a few facts are fairly well established. At the age of thirty, after the first of several conferences with Mazda, Zoroaster began his propagandist activities. In Media his proclamation of a new faith appears to have roused the hostility of the priesthood. Migrating to Eastern Iran, he there found a zealous convert and defender in a certain king Vishtāspa, two of whose chief counsellors, the brothers Frashaostra and Jāmāspa, lent him their weighty support. Latterly his teaching met with wide acceptance also in the West. The story goes that he was killed during the Turanian

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iii. 3; ii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Its perfect archetype is Gaokerena, the Iranian "tree of life." See Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 439.

invasion of Balkh, shortly after completing his seventy-seventh year. In spite of the many legends connected with his name—he is stated to have laughed outright on the day of his birth, and lived on cheese in the desert<sup>1</sup>—Zoroaster must be regarded as a real personality who remodelled the old Magian religion to the extent of practically effecting a new creation. Everything points to the conclusion that the religion known by his name represents the transformation of the ancient Iranian folk religion in which the worship of deities like the war-god Inora was combined with that of natural elements, and with the recognition of moral forces. Virtually it gave to the former religion a new constitution. Plutarch (*Numa*) represents him as having been, like Lycurgus, Numa, and other famous legislators, “visited by a spirit of the gods,” and gives an account of his teaching in his *Isis and Osiris* (ch. 46 f.). The tendency to portray him in a legendary light grew until he was invested with supernatural powers and designated “the holy Zoroaster” (*Yasna*, lvii. 8).

Of the reputed sacred books of the Parsis a large part has been lost. What has been preserved is contained in the *Zend Avesta* (Zend=“life”; Avesta=(?) “interpretation”), a collection not merely of prayers and ethical precepts, but also of treatises on such subjects as agriculture, medicine, astronomy, etc., as well.<sup>2</sup> Its meaning is often obscure, yet it is not seldom characterized by fresh thought and sane judgement. The only part of it purporting to be in the actual words of Zoroaster is that named the *Gāthās* (“songs,” or metrical chants), consisting of words used at the court of his patron Vishtāspa. Where these are not dialogues with God and the archangels, they take the form chiefly of forecasts of the future, general pronouncements, and admonitions to disciples. “They represent the esoteric

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, vii. 15 ; xi. 97.

<sup>2</sup> See Note 8, p. 390.



side of Zoroaster's teaching in its ideal bearing rather than its outward rules and statutes." <sup>1</sup>

In the Avesta the divine character is attributed to *Ahura* (" Lord ") *Mazdao* (" wise "), latterly designated Ormazd. He is viewed as the eternally existent spiritual being, the creator and governor of the world. In his beneficent outlook upon the life of man he is continually thwarted by his own twin-brother, the evil spirit (*Angra Mainyush*=Ahriman) who, though relegated by the good spirit to the darkness of Hell in accordance with their oath of eternal enmity (*Yasna*, xlv. 2), continues through the instrumentality of his degenerate children the *daēvas* to be the source of whatever evil there is in the world.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile the good and evil spirits counteract each other, and their antagonism shews itself at every point in the present world's battlefield ; the triumphant supremacy of Ormazd is reserved for the future. From a doctrinal standpoint Ormazd is the essence of truth, and Ahriman the essence of falsehood. Though the *daēvas* still figure in the *Gāthās* as popular divinities, they were degraded by Zoroaster to the category of devils, and their votaries branded as idolaters. The god of fire, however, and kindred gods such as Mithra the god of day (Iranian Mithra) who figure in a later redaction of the Avesta but have no place in the *Gāthās*, remained objects of popular homage until accorded angelic rank. In this way the Persian cult was confined to Ormazd, and his *amshaspands* (arch-angels).

Around the throne of Zoroaster, the exalted Lord of the realm of light, stand the six Amesha Spentas (he himself being reckoned the seventh), " the immortal Holy Ones," who form his council and execute his behests. They are in fact personified abstractions embodying the

<sup>1</sup> Geldner, art. " Zoroastrianism " in *Ency. Bib.*, 14th ed.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Izeseline* in the Avesta, Ahriman was at first *light* (i.e. good), but because he was jealous of Ormazd his light was changed into darkness, and he was plunged into the abyss.

essential elements of Ormazd's future kingdom. Subordinate in rank to these are the *Izeds*, angelic spirits who are either personifications of the sun, fire, wind, etc., relics of Iranian mythology, or simply Zoroastrian abstractions. The first of them was Mithra. Though assigned some prominence in the later Avesta, they are almost absent from the Gāthās. Ormazd's antagonist Ahriman is similarly represented as surrounded by his confederate evil spirits. Corresponding to the seven Mazdean archangels are seven arch-demons of whom Aēshma, the impersonation of anger, is repeatedly referred to in the Avesta. In the active opposition between the powers of good and evil whatever measures are taken by Ormazd are counterbalanced by the machinations of Ahriman. The entire world is viewed as comprising two kingdoms, that of light and that of darkness, ruled respectively by Ahura and Ahriman, who wage ceaseless war by means of their encountering hosts. This warfare rages round the human soul, which, though created by Ormazd, is free to choose between good and evil. The man of virtuous deeds will not fail to be recompensed by Ormazd; the evil-doer, on the contrary, as the servant of Ahriman, will in the hereafter experience the fate befitting his earthly life, and be delivered to the dismal realm apportioned to the wicked. On the third night after death the soul comes to the Judge's Bridge (*cinvato peretu*), the junction of the two worlds, where good and evil deeds are weighed by two angels in impartial scales. Where the good preponderates, the way to heaven lies open, but in the contrary event the bridge contracts till the soul is hurled to destruction. In the case of an equipoise between good and evil, the soul is consigned to an intermediate state to await the final universal world judgement. For this the righteous and the wicked shall alike be raised, and the divine retribution effected. Ahriman will be finally overthrown and the world restored by the great hero-prophet

Saoshyant (*i.e.* "the useful" or "beneficial"). Heaven and earth will then become one, the sun will for ever shine, and the faithful be admitted to eternal bliss in the fellowship of Ormazd and his saints.

The revival of Zoroastrianism under the Sassanid kings after the collapse of the Achæmenidæ in B.C. 331 saw it become the official State religion, and its clergy welded into a firmly-compacted and hereditary hierarchy. To this sacerdotal order was due the elaboration of Zoroaster's teaching and the codification of Zoroastrian law. To them was entrusted the oversight of worship, as well as the interpretation of the law and the spiritual superintendence of the people. The offering of sacrifices and the exercise of discipline were exclusively in their hands. Like the Magians of a former day, they were also the directors of education.

It was in view of man's proneness to be misled by the lure of the evil powers that Ormazd resolved to send them a teacher to point out the true way of salvation. Zoroaster was accredited as that prophet. He claimed to have been divinely called to purge religion from the sensuality pertaining to the worship of the *daēvas* (*Yasna*, xliv. 9), and the reformed dualistic faith which he promulgated finally assumed the character of a monotheistic religion. Zoroastrianism thus purports to be a revelation,<sup>1</sup> and is logically evolved from the central dogma of the two spirits.

The conception of Ahriman is the most distinctive creation of Zoroastrian thought. Not only does it reflect the conflict in the prophet's day between the *Daēva* and *Ahura* cults; it also inspired the idea of applying the principle of dualism to the universe as a whole. The Zoroastrian creed went even beyond this. It asserted a supreme principle of duality, namely, the

<sup>1</sup> In the second fargard of the *Vendidad* Ormazd is represented as saying: "I have clearly revealed to him (Jamshid) the law of God and of Zoroaster."

Eternal, *Zervana Akerana*, or Time without limits. According to the later sect of the Zervanites, Ormazd and Ahriman were only derivative or secondary gods, originating as twin-sons of this fundamental principle of all—Infinity of Time.<sup>1</sup> This is the primeval Being, by whom the universe was created, and from whom Ormazd and Ahriman, the secondary principles, were produced. They in turn were invested with creative powers which were exercised by them at cross-purposes. Alongside of the conception of Ahriman, and ethically of far-reaching importance, there has to be placed the steadfast Zoroastrian assertion of the final victory of good over evil.

The Zoroastrian ethic is based upon the simple formula: "good thoughts, good words, good deeds." A life in accordance with this threefold requirement implied the whole-hearted worship and service of Ormazd and his angels, scrupulous truthfulness, bodily chastity, and divers ceremonial purifications—all this on the one hand, and on the other, absolute repudiation of Ahriman and all his works, constant resistance to his wiles, and active efforts to ruin his cause. The declaration of the Zend Avesta: "he who sows the ground with care and diligence acquires a greater stock of religious merit than he could gain by the repetition of ten thousand prayers," shews that Zoroaster attached less importance to ceremonial observances than was afterwards customary under the priestly régime. He abhorred the sacrificial use of the ox by the daēvas, and viewed the cow as a sacred animal gifted by Ormazd to man. In its later systematized form Zoroastrianism allowed corporal punishments enacted for the expulsion of the daēvas to be compounded for a money payment, although such absolution could be secured only through confession

<sup>1</sup> Infinity of Time certainly "seems rather a metaphysical abstraction than a real object endowed with self-consciousness, possessed of moral perfections."—Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, etc., i. ch. 8.

to the high-priest. The emphasis laid on the care of the poor is a striking feature in the ethical code of the Avesta, which also contains numerous precepts enjoining the practice of such moral duties as justice, mercy, generosity, etc. These provisions, it must be acknowledged, constitute a high ethical standard not unworthy of the great religion with which it was conjoined. Unfortunately, it was cumbered by an involved and frequently ridiculous ritual, to which absurd powers were ascribed—an incubus presumably imposed by alien priests towards the close of the Achæmenian dynasty. Despite such drawbacks, the opinion has been expressed that “upon the whole the ethical standard of the Avesta is not inferior to that of the Jewish Law, and of psalms like 15, 24<sup>1-6</sup>, 112.”<sup>1</sup> Be this as it may, it is worthy of note that in the Gāthās the rewards of righteousness are declared to be spiritual: they are viewed less as bringing circumstances into line with individual character than as the result of the victory of Ormazd over the combined powers of evil.

The influence of the religion of Zoroaster upon Christianity through the medium of the OT has become so much of a live question to-day as to have called forth the dictum that “it is no longer excusable to study the OT religion without comparing Zoroastrianism.”<sup>2</sup> Even if, as some scholars<sup>3</sup> think, its influence upon Judaism was comparatively slight, it may at least be safely said that its approximation to the faith of Israel was greater than in the case of any other ancient creed.

A close connexion between Zoroastrianism and Judaism is adumbrated in various ways—in their common monotheism (as contrasted with the later dualism of Zoroastrian belief), in their recognition of the sovereignty of God and His relation to the individual, in their repudiation of idol-worship, in their elaborate

<sup>1</sup> Cheyne, *op. cit.* p. 394.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 397.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Söderblom and Charles.

system of legal defilements and ceremonial purifications, in the importance attached to family ties, and in the direction of their legislation with a view to the formation of an agricultural people.

In these circumstances, and especially in view of the Dispersion of the Jews in regions beyond the Euphrates, it was almost inevitable that the Persian influence should be reflected in the OT. That it is so in respect of angelology and demonology is beyond dispute. In post-exilic times the spirit-world was conceived as tenanted by hosts of good and evil powers, varied in rank and performing distinctive functions. This point of view is already discernible in the visions of Ezekiel and Zechariah, but was afterwards more and more developed until the idea of a regularly graded hierarchy of good and evil spirits became nearly as firmly rooted in Jewish as in Zoroastrian religious thought. Its onward progress is already traceable in the Book of Daniel, in which at the head of the angels are princes individually named. The nations are also represented as watched over by their own special angelic guardians (10<sup>13</sup>. 20). It is, however, in the post-canonical writings that the Persian influence is seen at its height. The statement in Tob 12<sup>15</sup>: "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels which present the prayers of the saints," appears to reflect the idea of the seven Persian amshaspands, though it is the sole Zoroastrian trait in Tobit. Belief in guardian angels, albeit absent from the Gāthās, formed part of the newer Persian creed, had met with general acceptance in apostolic times (Ac 12<sup>15</sup>), and was held also with respect to nations and armies (2 Macc 10<sup>29f.</sup>, 11<sup>6</sup>, 15<sup>23</sup>). Notable, too, is the conception of elemental angels, according to which the snow, the dew, the rain, etc., have each a distinctive spirit (En 60<sup>16ff.</sup>). The Book of Jubilees carries this idea still further: the spirit within each of the different elements has again its angel, so that we are faced with

such subtle appellations as the angels of the fire-spirit, of the spirit of the sea, of the spirit of the hoar-frost, of the spirit of the dew, etc. Facts like these, estimated at their lowest, prove that from the impact made upon them by the Zoroastrian religion Jewish thinkers formulated their angelology in much greater detail than had previously obtained. Particularly was this the case among the Essenes and the Jews of Alexandria. We do not, of course, forget that the Sadducees denied the existence of angels at all.

The post-exilic period exhibits likewise a marked development in demonology. Prominent in this connexion is the story of the expulsion of the demon Asmodæus<sup>1</sup> in the Book of Tobit, which is the work of a writer with knowledge of Mesopotamia and of the Persian demonology. It is possibly a Jewish adaptation of a tale from Median folk-lore. The extent to which belief in evil spirits and the means of exorcizing them current in his day may also be gathered from Josephus (*BJ*, 7. 6. 3; *Ant.* 8. 2. 5). In the OT the Satan or Adversary appears as simply the agent of the Divine will, but in the Similitudes of Enoch he figures as the ruler of the fallen angels (54<sup>6</sup>) or satans, whose work it is to tempt (69<sup>4. 6</sup>), accuse (40<sup>7</sup>), or punish (53<sup>3</sup>, 56<sup>1</sup>). This ranking of dæmons and their subjection to one as their head—in the Parables Azāzel, but in the interpolated additions Semjāza—was probably due to Persian influence. In several of these pseudepigrapha Beliar<sup>2</sup> (apparently the NT Belial) is prominently mentioned as the Antichrist. The Book

<sup>1</sup> According to Reland and Winer, Asmodæus is derived from a Persian verb signifying to *tempt*. Gesenius, however, supports the common opinion that the true derivation is from the Hebrew *shāmad*, to *destroy*. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*, p. 805) points out that Asmodæus was regarded as the king of demons and the instigator of apostasy. It has been usual to identify the name with Aēshina Daēva.

<sup>2</sup> Schleusner regards Beliar as the Syrian, and Belial as the Hebrew form of the same word, but perhaps Belial was merely a *later* form.

of Enoch contains lists of evil angels and their leaders, along with their specific functions. Through a legendary development of Gn 6<sup>2-4</sup> the dæmons came to be viewed as the spirits of the giants begotten of the fallen angels and the daughters of men (En 16<sup>1</sup>): they will continue to work evil in the world until the judgement of Mastêmâ (Satan) (Jub 10<sup>8</sup>) or the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom (Jub 10<sup>8</sup>, 23<sup>29</sup>). Hence the question, "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*?" (Mt 8<sup>29</sup>).

Another direction in which the later Jewish literature shews a marked advance upon the OT position is that of eschatology. The Book of Enoch in particular enters into detailed descriptions of the last things and of the future world. In its oldest section it clearly asserts an individual judgement after death (22) upon the establishment *on earth* of the Messianic kingdom (92<sup>20ff.</sup>). With this the Book of Jubilees and the Apocalypse of Baruch are in substantial agreement. A growing conviction that the present earth is no fitting *locus* for the manifestation of an eternal Messianic kingdom led in the last pre-Christian century to a fundamental change in the view taken with regard both to the kingdom itself and the stage at which the final judgement will be enacted. The thought of a new heaven and a new earth corresponding to the Persian doctrine of the world's renewal, after purification by the ordeal of fire and molten metal, began to find favour, as did also, in keeping with this, the tendency to place the last judgement not at the beginning but at the close of the Messianic era.<sup>1</sup> The idea of a preliminary judgement contained in Daniel persists in Enoch (91-104), in the Assumption of Moses, and in the Apocalypses of Baruch and 2 (4) Esdras, the final judgement being mostly relegated to the close of the Messianic kingdom, and conceived as a forensic act applicable to the totality of angels and men. In

<sup>1</sup> In this respect the later portion of the Book of Enoch (91-104) differs from the earlier (37-71).



the period between the Testaments there was thus a decided approach towards the Christian doctrine of the judgement.

Distinct developments took place also in the views held respecting the abodes of the departed. Sheol is no longer merely the habitat of shades from which moral distinctions are absent, but a place of retributory awards (2 Macc 12<sup>42ff.</sup>). Beyond its recognition, however, as an intermediate stage between death and judgement, no fixed conception of it was reached. A similar indefiniteness surrounds the term "Paradise." This word is of Persian origin, and from signifying an enclosure or park came to be used of any region of enchanting delights (En 60<sup>23</sup>), and especially of the garden where the elect and righteous dwell (En 60<sup>8, 23</sup>), and where the tree of life is planted (2 (4) Esd 8<sup>52</sup>). But in the Similitudes the sanctified emerge from it into the Messianic kingdom, and indeed as a whole the Enoch literature exhibits no definite or consistent view regarding either its site or its occupants. According to Josephus (*BJ*, 2. 8. 11), the Essene idea of paradise was that of a sunny overseas realm where the holy companions were fanned by gentle breezes, and this is possibly a true reflex of Jewish notions in the first century A.D. In the previous century the older meaning attached to Gehenna or hell as the place of punishment for apostate Jews was extended to the wicked as a whole (2 (4) Esd 7<sup>36f.</sup>). On the other hand, its penal fires were no longer conceived as bodily torture, but as spiritual only (En 93<sup>3</sup>), and while it was regarded as a Purgatory for faithless Jews, it was looked on as the place of eternal punishment for Gentiles. In the Similitudes Gehenna is obliterated through the proclamation of new heavens and a new earth. This conception, which was akin to Parsism, left no room for spirits who have denied the name of the Lord of spirits: "unto the heaven they shall not ascend"

(45<sup>2</sup>), and "on the (transformed) earth they shall not set foot" (45<sup>5</sup>). During the last pre-Christian century Apocalyptic writers also began to speak of heaven as the eternal home of the righteous after the final judgement. Its portals will be opened to them (En 104<sup>2</sup>); their joy shall equal that of the angels (104<sup>4</sup>); and they shall become companions of the hosts of heaven (104<sup>6</sup>), and shine as the stars for ever and ever (104<sup>2</sup>, cf. Dn 12<sup>3</sup>).

In nothing was doctrinal development within this period more pronounced than with regard to the Resurrection. Not that there was any general agreement concerning its nature, extent, or time; on all of these points opinion varied. Specially noteworthy is it that as early as the second century B.C. the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in combination with that of immortality had taken definite shape.<sup>1</sup> Although the Parables of Enoch adhere to the older belief in the resurrection of the body, the resurrection was in the last century B.C. viewed for the most part either as purely spiritual (En 91-104; Ps of Sol) or as one in which the risen righteous shall be clothed in garments of glory and of life (En 62<sup>15f.</sup>). While the Pharisees held that they will be invested with bodies differing in kind from the present (*BJ* 2. 8. 14), the Essenes taught the immortality of the soul apart from a bodily resurrection. Influenced by the Platonic doctrine of the soul, Alexandrian Judaism stood for an incorporeal immortality, as likewise did the Hellenistic writer of 4 Maccabees (14<sup>3</sup>, 16<sup>12</sup>). As regards the scope of the resurrection, its extension to humanity as a whole occurs only in the Apocalypses of Baruch (30<sup>2ff.</sup>) and 2 (4) Esdras (7<sup>32ff.</sup>). In all other cases it is exclusively the resurrection of Israelites that is contem-

<sup>1</sup> 2 Macc 7<sup>9</sup>, 11, 36. As an epitome of the work of Jason of Cyrene this book represents the standpoint of the century previous to that of its own issue, which was probably towards the close of the last century B.C.

plated. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch, the dead will rise in the selfsame form as that in which they were entombed, in order that their identity may be established. Thereafter they will be transformed and exist only spiritually as blessed or accursed. In this we may discover a point of contact with the Pauline doctrine as set forth in 1 Co 15<sup>35ff.</sup> The time of the resurrection was conceived sometimes as that immediately preceding the Messianic era and sometimes as concurrent with its close. It would be going too far to say that during the period under review the belief in a personal resurrection had crystallized into a dogma in Israel. In certain quarters the old idea of Sheol still prevailed (Sir 17<sup>27f.</sup>, 41<sup>4</sup>; Bar 2<sup>17</sup>), and Sadducean materialism had to be reckoned with. Nevertheless the idea of a resurrection to immortal life was largely entertained in Jewish circles, and though cumbered with many variations and inconsistencies, ultimately won its way towards general acceptance.

What were the contributory causes of this marked development in Jewish eschatology? To this important question different answers have been given. The idea that it was due to speculative thought may certainly be put aside. More worthy of consideration is the contention of some that it was merely a progressive evolution of doctrines already latent in the OT, in which, for example, the restoration of Israel is figuratively represented as a rising again to prosperity and power (Ezek 37<sup>1-12</sup>). From this, it is supposed, it was in the onward course of thought a natural enough step to conclude that the righteous would be raised to share in the glories of the future Messianic kingdom. Of late the opinion has been gaining ground that it was to the stimulating influence of other creeds that the advance in question must be traced. What, then, were these foreign influences? There is no reason to think that they were Egyptian or Greek. No analogy whatever

can be found between Egyptian and apocalyptic beliefs. The apocalyptic standpoint is equally incompatible with the culture of the Greeks, for whom the golden age lay not in the future but in the past. Among the Hellenistic Jews Messianic expectations receded rather than advanced. Philo's hope that men would at length attain to the knowledge of the true God rested upon the foundation of intellectual culture and not upon that of miraculous intervention from on high. The foreign influence to which we are here specially pointed is that of Parsism. Not wholly without force, but too vague to be reckoned a determining factor in the case, is the presumption that the Jews would look with a friendly eye on the religion of their liberators. But on the authority of Theopompus (quoted by Plutarch) it must be accepted as true that by the time of Alexander, if not earlier, the resurrection was an article of faith among the disciples of Zoroaster, and therefore anterior to any trace of it in the OT, at least as applicable to individuals. On purely historical grounds, therefore, this theory is not barred, although its validity depends of course on the date to be assigned to such statements as those of Ps 49<sup>15</sup> and Is 26<sup>19</sup>. According to Cheyne, some Biblical passages require to be re-read, amongst them Is 25<sup>8</sup>, which points to the destruction of death, on which the religion of Mazda laid peculiar stress. In Ps 16<sup>10f.</sup> and Ps 17<sup>15</sup>, possibly "in the light of Zoroastrian belief," the soul is represented as passing straight from earthly life to the beatific vision. On the contrary, the writer of 2 Maccabees apparently postpones the reward of the righteous to the resurrection (12<sup>43ff.</sup>). In the account given of Essenian beliefs by Josephus (*BJ*, 2. 8. 11) Cheyne finds "a natural combination of Hebraized Babylonian and Persian elements." The reference in Is 24<sup>21f.</sup> to the imprisonment of evil powers pending their judgement "after many days" may not improbably reflect Zoroastrian influence. In En 18<sup>14</sup>, 21<sup>6</sup>, and Jude <sup>6</sup>, the

same idea receives later expression. The "refiner's fire" and burning "oven" of Mal 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup> are figures possibly suggested by the Persian doctrine of the world's renovation after purification by fire. Psalms of the Persian period seem to present affinities with the Mazdean conception of the dawn as a daily emblem of the resurrection (Ps 17<sup>15</sup>, 49<sup>14</sup>). Traces of Parsism occur also in the apocalyptic books: for example, in addition to the idea of the transformed heaven and earth already referred to, a genuinely Parsi feature occurs in the placing of the mountain of God's throne in the *South* (En 18<sup>6</sup>, 77<sup>1</sup>), corresponding to a hell in the *North* (Secrets of En 10). Further, it is incontestable that such Persian conceptions as Satan's vain assault upon heaven, the casting out and binding of the great dragon, the millennium, and the new heaven and the new earth were taken over by the author of the Book of Revelation from the earlier apocalyptic writings. On the other hand, the idea that Is 45<sup>7</sup> contains an allusion to the religion of Cyrus has been practically relinquished.

The theory of Parsi influence as the source of the development in Jewish eschatology has not lacked powerful advocacy. Gesenius, for instance, considers it not surprising that the Jews should have taken over the doctrine of the resurrection from the Zoroastrian theology and related it to their own Messianic ideas, with a view to solving the riddle of the unhappy lot of the pious dead by affirming their participation in the joys of the coming kingdom.<sup>1</sup> In this language there is a mixture of truth and error. Not only does it rather rashly imply transference pure and simple, but it also ignores the fact that the Jewish doctrine differed in important respects from the Persian. Whereas Parsism taught the resurrection of all and sundry, in Judaism it was limited in the first instance to the pious, the re-

<sup>1</sup> *Der Prophet Jesaia*, Com. *ad loc.*

urrection of the entire human race being conceived as subsequent to the advent of Jahweh's king. On the other hand, from what is said concerning the linking up of the resurrection doctrine with Messianic hopes there is no call to dissent. A more recent scholar, who strongly supports the theory of Persian influence, does not contend that the Jewish belief in immortality was "in the strict sense borrowed," but only that "without this foreign influence" it "would not, so far as we can see, have been fully reached."<sup>1</sup> In its extremest form, according to which there was direct transference of the doctrine from the Mazdean creed, this theory must be rejected for two reasons, (1) because the Jewish doctrine of a partial resurrection is absent from the Zend Avesta ; (2) because the later Jewish belief regarding the resurrection did not emerge all at once, but was the result of a gradual evolution. It reached definite shape through the impetus derived from the revival of national sentiment at the Maccabaeon crisis. This led to the matured conviction that those who had given their lives in the interests of the future Messianic kingdom would be raised up to inherit its joys. The resurrection thus marked the true fulfilment of the Messianic hope, and was claimed as the exclusive prerogative of Israelites. That is to say, it was no mere product of Hebraized Zoroastrianism. While no doubt stimulated by Persian influences, it must be regarded as essentially the fruit of the nation's own religious experience. If it owed anything to foreign associations, it was only the harmless incorporation with it of certain elements of Parsism through which the Jewish people found a means at once of realizing their inmost spiritual yearnings, and of giving more definite shape and fuller expression to the didactic statement of their dogmatic beliefs.

In some of its later developments Zoroastrianism was repellent to Judaism. Except for the small extent to

<sup>1</sup> Cheyne, *OP*, p. 402.

which it helped to give consistency to primitive popular imaginations regarding evil spirits—a matter that never penetrated deeply the religious consciousness of the Jews—no alteration was produced upon Hebrew monotheism by Persian dualism.<sup>1</sup> The crass absurdities of its ceremonial suggest a closer affinity with the Mystery Religions than with that of the Jewish people. By some of its modern adherents this is openly avowed. The claim is made that the sayings of its founder are full of divine truths buried in mystic terms intelligible only to the wise. In this way Ahriman is represented as merely a parabolic emblem of evil, although the Bundāhis distinctly depicts him as its author and prince.

That there was a Pagan as well as a Jewish preparation for Christianity must be frankly recognized. In particular, the keen search after God pursued in the schools of Greek philosophy threw up a wealth of spiritual values in the light of which we can better grasp the significance of the Christian gospel, wherein the gropings of the human intellect were to find their ultimate satisfaction. Imperial Rome, with its legislative enactments for maintaining discipline and order, and its efficient linking up of the various countries of the world into a unity, together with the opening up of communications between them, also materially contributed toward the practicability of the first preaching of the Christian gospel. Though in a lesser degree, Persian influence, too, as mediated through Judaism, has to be recognized. In fine, “the reluctance which many excellent persons feel to believe that Christianity as it actually exists in the world, derived anything from the paganism in the midst of which it arose, is not altogether reasonable.”<sup>2</sup> This is not to say that Christianity was merely a product of contemporary forces at work

<sup>1</sup> Nicolas, *Les Doc. Rel. des Juifs*, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> Canon Cheetham, *Hulsean Lectures for 1896-97*, p. xiv.

in the world. Its vital and distinctive teaching was independent of pagan thought. Under the older religions many had come to be convinced of the vanity of mere worldly pursuits, but apart from the Christian message: "This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent," they could find no rest for their souls.



## CHAPTER II

### OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

HAVING already sketched the religious life of the Jews at the time of our Lord, we may now fittingly enter upon the wider question of the religious influence of the Hebrew faith. And here it may be observed at the outset that the value of Judaism as a factor in the evolution of religion has been obscured by the tendency to estimate it too much in terms of the situation presented by the quarrelling sectaries of the time of Christ. Christianity was the ripe fruit of the antecedent history. As there was a spirit of Greece and a spirit of Rome, so also there was a spirit of Judæa. In his essay on Heine, Matthew Arnold says: "He had in him both the spirit of Greece and the spirit of Judæa. By his perfection of literary form, by his love of clearness, by his love of beauty, Heine is Greek; by his intensity, by his untameableness, by his 'longing which cannot be uttered,' he is Hebrew"—a juxtaposition which fully recognizes the distinctive sublimity of the Hebrew genius.

To understand the characteristically new element with which Judaism enriched the spiritual heritage of the race, we must above all turn to Hebrew prophecy, which represents a most important stage in pre-Christian religion. The prophets constitute the lasting glory of ancient Israel. They were not philosophers, but seers; their genius was not metaphysical, but religious. In the light of Israel's past history they expressed ideal truths applicable to their own times, and capable of ever fresh fulfilment in the future. Their great theme

was holiness, and the judgements necessitated by the lack of it. They were the exponents of "ethical monotheism." They taught and exemplified faith in the One God—"the Holy One of Israel." In their teaching, therefore, there was both a religious element and an ethical, a doctrine of God and of duty.

All true Israelites from the Mosaic period onwards were essentially monotheists; yet the prophets of the Assyrian age and their successors gave new point and emphasis to the truth that *Jahweh is the one living and true God* (Jer 10<sup>10</sup>).<sup>1</sup> They did not, indeed, theorize upon the subject, for they regarded it as beyond the pale of argument. Their monotheism was not a philosophically reasoned-out doctrine, but a practical religious faith. The false gods of the heathen they scorned as nonentities (*'ēlîlîm*, Is 2<sup>8</sup>. 18), or lies (Am 2<sup>4</sup>) as mere lumps of dead matter, without life or spirituality. And if they condemned the folly of idolatry, they were equally intolerant of the old nature-worship of the country (Is 1<sup>29f.</sup>). For them there was but one Divine Being; if other deities existed, they were powerless, and deserved neither respect nor worship. Micah describes them slightlying as the work of men's hands (5<sup>13</sup>); Jeremiah pours contempt upon them as impotent for good or evil (10<sup>2ff.</sup>); and the great prophet of the Exile directs his poignant satire upon the process of their manufacture (Is 40<sup>19f.</sup>).

In keeping with their monotheism the prophets assert the *universal sovereignty* of Jahweh. His position as the one God necessarily implies an exclusive sovereign right to the homage of men; His sway is world-wide, for beside Him there is none else (Is 44<sup>6</sup>. 8). Amos represents Him as the God of all His rational creatures—of the Philistines and Syrians as well as of His own

<sup>1</sup> "In a world where polytheism was rampant the first necessity was to stamp deep into the consciousness of Israel the unity of God."—Peake, *Christianity: Its Nature and its Truth*, p. 92.

peculiar people Israel (9<sup>7</sup>) ; Isaiah conceives Him as actively and providentially at work in the events of his time, with a view to the ultimate establishment of His righteous kingdom on the earth (5<sup>12</sup>, 10<sup>12. 19</sup>, etc.) ; Micah designates Him " the Lord of the whole earth " (4<sup>13</sup>) ; Jeremiah invokes Him as " King of nations " (10<sup>7</sup>). The stress which the prophets laid on the unique and absolute supremacy of Jahweh is accounted for by the outward circumstances of the Hebrew race from the eighth century downwards. Israel might be subject to Assyrians, Babylonians, or Persians, but her political subjection never carried with it acceptance of the worship of the conquering power. Her faith in Jahweh as no mere national God, but the one Lord of the whole earth, under whose controlling hand men of every kindred and tongue were made subservient to His purpose, knew no change save that of a deeper confirmation and an ever stronger development.

A third thing emphasized by the prophets is the *moral righteousness* of Jahweh. As the one living and true God, whose dominion is over all, He is also uniquely " holy." And with the prophets this epithet attains a new significance. Among the Semites every tribe had its own god, and every such god was reckoned " holy." According to this usage the word does not denote moral purity, but merely the abstract quality of deity. Many of the so-called " holy gods " (Dn 4<sup>8</sup>, etc.) of paganism were, even from the standpoint of their worshippers, immoral beings ; and in like manner everything set apart for religious use was counted " holy," whether in itself having an ethical character or not. The prophets (particularly Isaiah) limited the application of the term to Jahweh, and represented Him as sole possessor of the attributes of Godhead. The cleavage thus made between Jahweh and all other claimants of the prerogatives of Deity is a fact of the deepest significance for the religious history of Israel. According to the

united shewing of the prophets, "the Holy One of Israel" stands upon a pedestal by Himself as the God of revelation, uniquely perfect in His moral character and infinitely removed from all other deities whatsoever. To Him moral evil, anywhere and everywhere, in Israel or beyond it, is an object of utter abhorrence and condemnation. He is "of too pure eyes to behold evil" (Hab 1<sup>13</sup>).

To the prophets Jahweh is also the God of *gracious purposes and sublime deeds*. He is the ever-living, ever-acting Creator, whose doings form the chain that links together the creation of the old world and the ushering in of "new heavens and a new earth" (Is 65<sup>17</sup>, 66<sup>22</sup>). In the free exercise of His own will, and unhampered by any order of nature, He is at work all the time, and history is but the record of His unresting activity. "To the Jews," says Wernle, "God never appears as the being who merely sets the world in motion and regulates its course, though that is a part of His government, but He is the free Creator, the Creator in every moment of time. All is history, even nature."<sup>1</sup>

It is further noteworthy that the prophets were not blind to the most essential element in religion, namely, *emotional fellowship with the Unseen*, or "dwelling in the secret place of the Most High" (Ps 91<sup>1</sup>). For the pious Israelite to have such communion was to delight in God, and to be conscious that God took delight in him (Job 22<sup>26</sup>; Ps 37<sup>4</sup>; Pr 11<sup>20</sup>; Zeph 3<sup>17</sup>, etc.). Communion means more than personal intercourse; it implies happy fellowship. The Israelite enjoyed communion with God in His works (Ps 104) and in His word (Ps 1<sup>2</sup>). Jewish piety, however, lay under the limitations of special historical conditions and national feeling. Prophets and psalmists had visions of God's power and glory (Ps 63<sup>2</sup>), but they wanted more. They craved for a clearer manifestation (Job 23<sup>3</sup>), for a fuller

<sup>1</sup> *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 17.

satisfaction (Ps 17<sup>15</sup>), for an embodiment of the unseen God—in short, for an Incarnation. In the fulness of time God granted this boon, and now we are privileged to see what these and many others desired to see—the Word made flesh.

On its *ethical* side the teaching of the prophets corresponded to their doctrine of God. The principle underlying it was that the knowledge of God's spiritual moral nature must necessarily determine the character of His worship. With one voice they declared the worship of God to consist not in formal sacrifices or in ceremonial rectitude, but in moral conduct. They demanded a moral righteousness in man corresponding to the fixed moral righteousness of God. They asserted that the secret of finding Jahweh is mercy, and not sacrifice, righteousness, and not ritual. They taught that feasts and sacrifices form no essential element of religion, and are quite worthless in the absence of integrity of heart and life. The truth of this contention is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the destruction of the Temple had no appreciable effect upon Judaism. According to the prophets, then, what God requires is attention to the plain duties of morality; and for this there can be no substitute. In their view, life and faith are inseparably connected; there is no such thing as a non-moral piety. If the ethical element is less prominent than the religious, it is none the less present, and the one is indissolubly bound up with the other. Alone among the teachers of pre-Christian times, the prophets sought to cultivate a sense of sin among those to whom their message was addressed. They aimed at exposing sin that men might forsake it. At the same time they inculcated the principles of positive morality. They pointed out that while Jahweh could never be satisfied with a religion of sacrifices, festivals, and pilgrimages, Israel could please Him by ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, by seeking judgement and relieving the oppressed,

by judging the fatherless and pleading for the widow (Is 1<sup>17</sup>).

By their own intuitive religious genius and faithfulness to the still small voice within their own souls the prophets reached a new conception not only of God's moral nature and government, but also of Israel's calling as a holy nation. If the Pharisees afterwards valued morality merely as satisfying the commandments, this was entirely contrary to the spirit and teaching of the prophets, who valued morality only as the verdict of the conscience. The position taken up by the Pharisees was perhaps the logical development of the Priestly Code, but it meant turning morality into its opposite. As much weight was attached to purely external enactments as to precepts of the highest moral importance. To shun evil was regarded as more meritorious than to do good. Ethics was reduced to mere casuistry. It is clear, however, from the Wisdom literature that even in later Judaism there existed a simple popular morality which did by no means subordinate the importance of purity of motive to mere external legalism.

That the ethical influence of the prophets had not become a dead letter is proved above all by the state of Jewish domestic life. Of this, as it existed in the Far East, we have an idyllic picture in the Book of Tobit. The truth is, there was nowhere at this epoch a finer type of family life than that which prevailed among the Jews. In that favoured nation a great historical development had been going on for centuries, "a tendency making for righteousness," not blindly, however, but under the guiding hand of God. And this affected the life of the family as it affected the larger life of the nation. At first we find some little inclination towards polygamy, and the Hebrews were certainly no strangers to a mild form of household slavery. But in the onward march of the national life the family relations became gradually healthier. Very powerful in this direction was the

influence of the prophets, whose warnings were disregarded always at great cost to the delinquent. With a growing faith in the reality of the divine judgements the Jew came to look on the old patriarchal standard as representing the minimum of his obligation with respect to family life. Two things especially mark off the Jewish practice from that of the contemporary heathen world—their social purity, and the comparatively influential position of women. As regards the first, there can be no manner of doubt; it was part of their religion. The high standard of family attachment and conjugal fidelity for which the Jews are still everywhere known has come down from these old times untarnished and unchanged. Among them the place given to woman was also far in advance of the position assigned her in the heathen world. “The chapter in the Book of Proverbs about the ‘virtuous woman’ could not have been written except in a country where there was a high idea of a wife, of her privileges and duties.”<sup>1</sup> Alongside of the matchless story of Ruth, with its delineation of a rural life in which there is a singular combination of simplicity, sweetness, and purity, we have to place the sterner incidents connected with the storied “mother of the Maccabees.” Not every Jewish matron, of course, attained such a high degree of piety and worth; but these were actual specimens, not ideal pictures. And could anything exceed the tenderness of the bond, or the depth of the love, that united the family at Bethany, which was essentially Jewish as well as Christian? These facts reveal the vast superiority of the Jews over the pagans in the matter of domestic life. Here, as elsewhere, Judaism was but the forerunner of Christianity, not attaining indeed the perfect standard of the religion of Jesus, yet leading up to it, and preparing its way.

In the prophetic teaching the knowledge of God’s

<sup>1</sup> Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, p. 147.

nature as spiritual and moral has also a direct bearing upon *the range of His worship*. Being what He is, His relationship to man could not remain always particularistic. The Jews were the peculiar people of Jahweh, but the blessings conferred on them were bestowed with a view to the whole earth being won for Him. They received the Divine revelation in order that they might transmit it to the world, and in some measure at least they gave evidence of cosmopolitan tendencies commensurate with their great vocation. In like manner, although Jahweh is the special national God of Israel, He is not indifferent to the well-being of the rest of the human race. By His providential ordering of the course of history He was slowly but surely preparing the world for Christianity. It is only through the recognition of these cognate truths that we can realize what constitutes the distinctive feature of the religion of the Jews. This was not monotheism, which had already become the belief of the more enlightened among the heathen, but the historical and teleological character of their faith in God. This faith rested upon His great deeds and gracious intentions. It took account of actual deliverances for Israel, and of prospective blessings for all mankind: "Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people" (Is 56<sup>7</sup>). Apart from the conviction that Israel's religion was a religion for all, the proselytizing propaganda carried on by the Jews would be unintelligible. Precisely herein lay its motive power. The prophets represent Jahweh not only as far excelling in might the gods of the heathen, but also as controlling by His moral will the destinies of all the nations for moral ends. This led them to entertain the hope that ultimately the nations would join with Israel in paying homage to Jahweh upon His holy hill of Zion. And thus in spite of their leanings towards universalism the prophets still retained a tinge of national particularism. In their ideal delineations of



the future, Zion is celebrated as the source and centre of Divine revelation, while in the unfolding of the great historical drama Israel plays the chief part, the other nations serving merely as acolytes.

Besides being preachers of ethical monotheism, the prophets proclaimed *the Messianic hope*. The Jews never lost the consciousness of their high destiny as the chosen people of an all-powerful God. In political bondage and darkest misfortune they firmly believed that before their nation there lay a glorious future. But this national hope soon assumed a more definite shape. It came frequently to be centred upon a *personal* Messiah, in the form of a Davidic king. Under this unique deliverer their rightful position would be secured, and their national prestige as Jahweh's peculiar people restored.

In one or other of the forms referred to above (p. 125 ff.) the Messianic expectation had been current in Israel ever since it had been proclaimed by the great prophets of the eighth century. Under the stimulus of the wars of the Maccabees it sprang into fresh vitality (2 Macc 2<sup>18</sup> ; (?) Ps 110), and latterly so animated the Jews that the whole pagan world became cognizant of it. Throughout the East there was a widespread expectation that a great conqueror would appear in Judæa. If Roman poetry furnishes only a vague allusion to the prevalence of the idea of the impending advent of a heaven-born child,<sup>1</sup> the Roman historian Suetonius is quite explicit in connecting the new dominion with Judæa.<sup>2</sup> In the form in which it was cherished by the Jews themselves it was both a religious and a political hope—religious in so far as they longed for one who would lead them in the paths of righteousness and enable them

<sup>1</sup> Vergil, *Eclogue*, iv.

<sup>2</sup> "Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur" (*Vesp.* 4). Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 13) speaks in almost identical terms.

to win back the favour of Jahweh, and political in so far as they looked forward to position of supremacy over the heathen, who should be subject to them as the plenipotentiaries of the Eternal King.

The distinctive Jewish contribution towards the preparation for Christianity was thus essentially a religious one. Comparatively few in number, inhabiting only a small strip of land, knowing nothing of philosophy or science, without the artistic sense of Greece or the political power of Rome, the Jews have nevertheless beyond doubt been the greatest spiritual and moral force in the world. In the sphere of religion they have been of epoch-making importance. Our very conception of God is largely derived from the Hebrews. Modern culture as a whole is saturated with tenderness and impulses of Israelitish origin. The great mass of our people are more familiar with Biblical history than with that of any country, even their own. The figures hung in our mental galleries are not those of Ulysses and Agamemnon, Alexander and Cæsar, Socrates and Seneca, but they are the figures of Joseph and Moses, Saul and David, Elijah and Daniel ; they are the figures of the Christ, of the Evangelists and apostles. It must ever remain a fundamental truth that "salvation is of the Jews." To them it was given to open up a new world of communion with God, and to introduce the human race to a realm of spiritual ideas and feelings which have been the most powerful regenerating force known to history. When Frederick II. asked his chaplain for a proof of the hand of God in history, he received the striking and memorable reply : "Sire, the Jews." In the sphere of morals also Judaism has rendered the utmost service. By the institution of the Decalogue, and by its insistence that "righteousness exalteth a nation," it has kept up the moral level of the world. Once enunciated, this ideal of national greatness could never again be lost sight of, and it remains the task of Christianity to see it

translated into actual fact. It is this unique development of the religious and ethical side of human nature that has invested the history of Israel with such profound significance and enduring interest. "As long as the world lasts," says Matthew Arnold, "all who want to make progress in righteousness will come to Israel for inspiration."<sup>1</sup> Quite in accord with this pronouncement is that of Bousset: "Judaism absorbed the essential elements of foreign religion and brought them to a positive height." It was the retort in which were collected the different elements<sup>2</sup> presently to be fused in the new and marvellous creation of the Gospel. Paganism could not grasp the true relation between creature and Creator. Judaism recognizes this, but fails to bridge the distance between them. Christianity solves the problem by its glad tidings of the incarnation of God in Christ Jesus. Where the light of revelation is

<sup>1</sup> That the German Nazis should have embarked upon a policy of harshness towards all belonging to the Jewish race is from the Christian and ethical standpoint deeply to be deplored. Not only is it an obstacle in the way of the Christian programme; it is an utter negation of Christianity itself. And that in the land of Luther! By no possibility can that religion be dissociated from the fact that its Founder was Himself a Jew, and from the declaration of the apostle that those of Israelitish lineage are "beloved for the fathers' sakes" (Ro 11<sup>30</sup>). The evolution of the "German Christian" is really a reflexion of the Hitlerite militancy. In the religion of Jesus there is no place for arrogant nationalism or racial distinction: "there is neither Greek nor Jew . . . barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free" (Col 3<sup>11</sup>). It is not surprising that under the leadership of a noted theologian, Karl Barth of Bonn, a strong protest against Aryan domination in the Evangelical Church of Germany was forthcoming, and that a resolute assertion of her spiritual independence was signed by thousands of her ministers, with the result that Herr Hitler appears to have seen the wisdom of a policy of moderation, and that the plan of "reforming" the Church by political dictatorship has been considerably modified. The end is not yet, but the incidents that have taken place reveal the extent to which Protestant feeling has been aroused by the Nazi President's ill-starred attempt to impose his distasteful authority in the sphere of religion.

<sup>2</sup> *Religion des Judentums*, p. 493.

lacking, or even where, as in Plato or Zoroaster, some transient flashes speed across the darkness, the conditions of intelligent worship are not realized.

Three powerful and dominating influences had left their mark on the world into which the first missionaries of Christianity went forth. The genius and spirit of Greece, culminating in the conquests of Alexander, and propagating themselves in the form of numerous colonies of Greek-speaking inhabitants, had strongly asserted themselves by the fourth century B.C. In the course of two or three centuries thereafter the mastership of the world fell to the Romans, who excelled in the sphere of practical government. They concerned themselves not with thought and art, but with law and order. Their virtues were those of the soldier, the governor, and the road-maker. If Greece supplied the forms of thought by means of which the Christian faith was to find theological expression, the Romans made the solid highways along which its messengers were to carry it to distant lands. And thus in the providence of God these two races served an important purpose in materially preparing the way of the Lord upon earth. It needed, however, the peculiar service which the Jews were alone fitted to render to complete the preparation on the path of history for the successful propagation of the Gospel. Their contribution was their belief in God, the possession of the Holy Scriptures, and their great institution of the synagogue. There are other powerful factors in moulding history besides those represented by the philosopher and the jurist, but none more notable than that furnished by true religion. It was because in those early times the Jews were the trustees of this best of God's gifts to humanity that their influence upon the life of our race has not been surpassed by either Greek or Roman. Thus, then, came it to pass that to a world overrun previously by the arms and culture of Greece, disciplined by the strong

hand of Rome, and dotted over with Jewish synagogues, Paul and his comrades went forth bearing the precious seed of the Gospel, in order that it might once more be conquered, but this time for God and for truth.

PART FOUR  
THE DOCTRINAL BACKGROUND



## CHAPTER I

THE three essential parts of our Christian faith are, in their proper order, the fact of Sin, the fact of Christ, and the fact of the Spirit. Conjointly these form the theological background of the NT Epistles. In this great trilogy the dominating idea is love. Love is represented as the motive (1 Tim 1<sup>5</sup>) and complete fulfilment (Ro 13<sup>8-10</sup>) of the law, breaches of which are reckoned as sin (1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup>). The incarnation of the Son of God and the redemption of fallen humanity by His sacrificial death upon the cross are set forth in combination as the supreme act of divine love: love prompted to sacrifice (1 Jn 4<sup>10</sup>), and laid the foundation for forgiveness (Col 1<sup>14</sup>). Further, it is declared that this love is "shed abroad in our hearts by the gift of the Holy Spirit," the spirit of the Risen Christ (Ro 5<sup>5</sup>).

### THE FACT OF SIN

It is beyond our province here to enter upon any metaphysical discussion regarding the origin of evil. As "the greatest riddle of the world" this has been the theme of endless debate, but we are concerned only to recognize that in Scripture its existence, nature, and reality are assumed as axiomatic. Its existence is fully established by the declaration that "there is no man that sinneth not" (1 Ki 8<sup>46</sup>, cf. Eccles 3<sup>21</sup>), and that "there is none righteous, no, not one" (Ro 3<sup>10f.</sup>). Its nature is indicated, for example, by the statements that Rehoboam, King of Judah, "forsook the law of the Lord" (2 Chron 12<sup>1</sup>), "transgressed against the law of the Lord" (12<sup>2</sup>) and "did evil" (12<sup>14</sup>), "and that



Jeroboam and certain other kings of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord by their idolatry and contempt for His law (1 Ki 14<sup>9</sup>, 16<sup>25-30</sup>). Its reality is clearly implied in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our debts" and "Deliver us from evil," and is only too apparent both in the lives of individuals and in the wider range of society.

NT ideas of sin and salvation are manifestly rooted in the thought of the OT and later Jewish writings. To trace in detail the historical development of these conceptions would occupy too much of our space; the main points may, however, be briefly summarized.<sup>1</sup> In early Hebrew religion there was no formulated doctrine of sin, salvation being conceived as Jahweh's deliverance through human instrumentality of His people from their national foes (1 Sam 9<sup>18</sup>; Judg 3<sup>9, 15</sup>), and in general from life's calamities and distresses so as to secure their prosperity (Ps 118<sup>25</sup>). The salvation of individuals was less in view than that of the nation, of which the individual was only a part. Jahweh's wrath, aroused by national or individual transgression of His declared will, might shew itself in punishment of sin so committed. In spite of dark days of oppression by their enemies the Hebrews believed that sooner or later the Lord of Hosts would come to their rescue and secure their welfare (Am 5<sup>14</sup>). This future deliverance was known as "the day of the Lord" (Am 5<sup>18</sup>; Zeph 1<sup>14</sup>).

By the pre-exilic prophets Jahweh is no longer conceived as merely the God of Israel, but as the God of absolute righteousness, whose judgement of His own people will be just like that meted out to other nations (Am 3<sup>2</sup>; Is 2<sup>12-17</sup>). The day of Jahweh, instead of being merely a day of destruction for the enemies of Israel, will also be a day of judgement on His own people who have turned idolatrously to other gods (Is 2<sup>6ff.</sup>;

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller statement, see R. S. Franks, *Man, Sin, and Salvation*, in the Century Bible Handbooks.

Jer 11<sup>10</sup>). True repentance is declared to be the only cure for calamities which are the punishment of sin (Is 1<sup>18ff.</sup>; Hos 14<sup>1</sup>), and the point is stressed that God demands a piety not limited to ritualistic observances (Hos 6<sup>6</sup>; Mic 6<sup>7f.</sup>). Following upon the day of judgement there will ensue a future salvation under a restored and righteous Kingdom, either mediately through one or more human representatives (Is 9<sup>1-7</sup>, 11<sup>1-9</sup>, 35<sup>1-5</sup>), or directly under the sovereignty of God Himself (Is 4<sup>2-6</sup>). Of special importance to the conceptions of sin and salvation is the emphasis laid by Jeremiah on "sin in the heart" as the source of transgressions on the part either of the nation (7<sup>24</sup>, 11<sup>8</sup>, etc.) or of the individual (18<sup>11</sup>, 25<sup>5</sup>, etc.). In both cases alike he asserts the necessity of repentance. Ezekiel takes up the same position (36<sup>28</sup>), and reckons forgiveness amongst the blessings of the future salvation (36<sup>25, 29</sup>). Alongside of the future salvation of the nation both prophets also propound the doctrine of an antecedent retribution for individuals (Jer 31<sup>30</sup>; Ezek 3<sup>16ff.</sup>, 18<sup>4</sup>). In Deuteronomy expression is given to the idea that Israel as a nation, and individuals as well, might attain prosperity by careful attention to the divine law, including obedience to ritualistic observances to which the prophets attached but little importance. The Priestly Code of later date views the law from the special standpoint of holiness, sharply differentiating between the religious and the secular (Lev 20<sup>26</sup>), and greatly exceeding Deuteronomy in its insistence upon the satisfaction of ceremonial requirements as the mark of separation from the heathen (Lev 20<sup>24f.</sup>). For sins of ignorance it recognizes the atoning efficacy of sacrifice (Num 15<sup>27ff.</sup>), which are conceived as a means of fellowship between God and His worshippers through the uniting symbol of the besprinkled blood of the covenant (Ex 24<sup>5-8</sup>), and in accordance with the principle that "the blood is the life" (Lev 17<sup>11</sup>).

In the prophetic literature dating from and after the Exile the judgement which is to usher in the great salvation is no longer represented as falling upon the Israelitish nation collectively, but only upon the ungodly within it, and upon its enemies (Is 43<sup>14</sup>, 47<sup>1ff.</sup>; Zech 1<sup>18ff.</sup>). Israel's guilt has been expiated by the disaster which has befallen her (Is 40<sup>1f.</sup>), and now she is conceived as the righteous nation in contrast to the unrighteous heathen, and as "justified" in the sight of the righteous Jahweh (Is 45<sup>25</sup>, 50<sup>8</sup>). The extent to which the heathen will suffer from the judgement is variously computed. Sometimes it is depicted as utter destruction (Ezek 38, 39), at other times as serfdom in subjection to Israel (Is 61<sup>5</sup>). Occasionally also they are called upon to turn to the only true God, and so become partakers in the great salvation. The most remarkable oracle in this connexion is that of Is 52<sup>13</sup>–53<sup>12</sup>, in which the ideal Israel as the suffering servant of Jahweh is delineated as vicariously bearing the sins of the nations (Is 53<sup>4ff.</sup>).<sup>1</sup> "The servant shall come into communion with the Gentiles through Israel redeemed, and in this way become their 'light'" (Is 60<sup>2</sup>).<sup>2</sup> At the close of the OT stress is laid upon obedience to Jahweh as the necessary prelude to the realization of the promised salvation of Israel as a nation (Mal 3<sup>10-12</sup>), while the present salvation of individuals is betokened by the prosperity of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked (Mal 4<sup>1f.</sup>). Together with a keen apprehension of the significance of sin and of salvation, these ideas are fully reflected in the Psalms. In the apocalyptic literature the hope of the advent of the Kingdom of God is bound up with the thought of a new world as already expressed in Is 65<sup>17</sup>. It is hailed not only as

<sup>1</sup> On the difficult question whether "the Servant" is to be viewed as the ideal Israel or as an individual yet to arise, see the discussion by Dr. Skinner in the *Cambridge Bible* (Intro. p. xxxiii ff., and Note 1 in Appendix).

<sup>2</sup> A. B. Davidson, *Expositor*, 2nd Series, vii. p. 91.

the climax in the life of the nation, but also as transcending altogether the limitations of earthly existence. In Enoch there is introduced a conception which became the common property of Jewish apocalypses—that of the setting up of the new Jerusalem as the habitation of the righteous (90<sup>34</sup>). If in 2 (4) Esdras only a temporary kingdom is expected, in the Apocalypse of Baruch—both written after A.D. 70—the idea of a brighter prospect for the nation entirely disappears, and salvation is confined to righteous individuals (13<sup>3</sup>). While, apart from a single passage in Enoch (90<sup>37f.</sup>), the coming of a Messiah is absent from the writings of the second century B.C., in the earlier part of the succeeding century the Messianic expectation was widely current. As regards the fate of the heathen the later Jewish compositions exhibit no uniformity, but in the course of the century immediately preceding the advent of Christ the idea of universal blessedness distinctly recedes (Epistle of Baruch in Apocrypha of OT, 4<sup>31ff.</sup>). Subsequently the hope of the future kingdom took on a more political complexion, and in the first century A.D. the party of the Zealots in particular regarded the overthrow of Rome by the Messiah as essential to its realization. To this movement the Pharisees were keenly antagonistic, contending that their sole duty was to carry out the precepts of the law.

In the post-exilic period the doctrine of the resurrection, to which the only specific OT references are found in Is 26<sup>1ff.</sup> and Dn 12<sup>2</sup>, forms an integral feature of the “future-hope” of Judaism. It is, however, a somewhat fluid conception. In the apocalyptic writings there is no uniformity of view as to the nature, the extent, or the time of the resurrection. Yet there is clearly a tendency to expand the idea of the resurrection of Israel into that of a general resurrection, and to bring Gentile and Jew, the wicked and the righteous, within the scope of the judgement. The

question whether the resurrection would precede or follow the establishment of the kingdom failed to excite interest owing to a radical change of outlook witnessed in the last pre-Christian century. The hope of a Messianic kingdom faded before the growing conviction of an individual immortality. Palestinian Judaism clung to the idea of a bodily resurrection (2 Macc 7<sup>11</sup>, 14<sup>46</sup>), but in Hellenistic circles, and especially in Alexandria, this was discarded in favour of the view that the spirit alone is immortal (Wisd 9<sup>15</sup>). During this period the Pharisees devoted themselves with such assiduity to the development of the law that the righteous individual had to satisfy a much more complicated body of precepts than that contained in the Deuteronomic code. According to Pharisaic reckoning deficiency of merit on the part of individual Israelites could, however, be atoned for by repentance, almsgiving, and other good works, and also by drawing upon the stored-up works of supererogation standing at the credit of saintly Israelites of old. Thus the martyr could expiate his people's guilt (4 Macc 6<sup>28</sup>, 17<sup>20ff.</sup>). Neither 2 (4) Ezra nor Baruch regard the Fall as exempting the individual from accountability for sin (2 (4) Ezra 9<sup>4</sup>; Bar 54<sup>15ff.</sup>). On the contrary, "each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul" (Bar 54<sup>19</sup>). Full freedom of will is claimed. Man's bodily frailty (Ps 103<sup>13f.</sup>), and his moral frailty, too, are associated with his being "flesh" and formed out of the dust of the ground. In the later Jewish literature death is viewed as the result of Adam's sin (2 (4) Ezra 3<sup>7</sup>; Bar 17<sup>3</sup>), but as yet there was no definite pronouncement upon the question of original sin.

According to Paul, who has treated the subject of sin more fully than any other NT writer, "all have sinned" (Ro 3<sup>23</sup>), and "the wages of sin is death" (Ro 6<sup>23</sup>). Such was the effect of Adam's fall, which inaugurated the reign of sin (Ro 5<sup>17. 21</sup>). It is further distinctive of Paul's doctrine that evil is inherent in

the flesh (Ro 8<sup>6f.</sup>)—a conception already current in Hellenistic Judaism as represented by Philo and the Book of Wisdom (9<sup>15</sup>)—and brings the human will into bondage (Ro 7<sup>14</sup>). Yet, so far is he from asserting that matter is essentially evil, that he definitely speaks of the sanctification of the body as the temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Co 6<sup>19</sup>). At the same time he does approximate to the Greek conception that the flesh as matter is intrinsically evil (Ro 7<sup>18</sup>, 8<sup>7</sup>). “We have, then, in Paul two theories of the origin of sin: the historical theory, which derives it from the fall of Adam, and the philosophical, or perhaps we may now call it the experimental theory, which derives it from the inherent sinfulness of the flesh.”<sup>1</sup> Whether these divergent views can be satisfactorily harmonized is a question to which no answer can be attempted here. Paul’s doctrine of sin, and his attitude towards the Jewish law with which it is inseparably bound up, will come into consideration at a later stage in connexion with his personal experience in relation to the fact of Christ, and the views of sin expressed in the non-Pauline epistles will be referred to under the same category of Christian experience.

The NT doctrine of sin relates itself closely to OT conceptions as traced above. It obviously takes over, while at the same time modifying, the results previously reached in the course of Jewish thought. Certain Hellenistic influences likewise enter into the presentation of the subject in the epistles of Paul and John, and in the letter to the Hebrews. It is also of prime importance to note that recognition of the fact of sin is viewed as the necessary prelude to the understanding of redemption as the essential core of Christianity.

According to the Westminster Confession, sin is “any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God.” This is a true reflexion of the apostolic declaration: “Whosoever committed sin transgresseth

<sup>1</sup> R. S. Franks, *op. cit.* p. 104.

also the law ; for sin is the transgression of the law " (1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup>). Sin, then, is lawlessness, whether we think of the law of Moses or the law of conscience. It is a revolt against the moral law as binding upon all men. It is an assertion of "self-sufficient individualism." Herein lies the essence of sin. Besides being a direct violation of the moral law, sin also consists in failure to respond to its imperative call to duty. And in both of these respects, according to the teaching of Christ and His apostles, regard must be had to the inward motive as well as to the outward act (Mt 19<sup>21</sup> ; Ro 2<sup>29</sup> ; 1 Co 4<sup>5</sup>). Evil, therefore, is not confined to overt transgression of the law, but also includes failure to comply with its demands as the spiritual expression of the will of God (Ro 7<sup>14</sup>). In this double sense it involves a distinct perversion of man's moral nature.

At the present day we are faced with a species of intellectual Bolshevism which repudiates the very idea of sin. This is the point of view of many popular writers who need not here be named. It is endorsed not only by Communists, but also by not a few Scientists, who reject the entire spiritual conception of life, disavow all belief in a personal God and a future existence, and represent the mind as "a soulless machine, and morality as merely "a matter of glands" (thyroid, pituitary, etc.). A sense of sin they regard as a chimera invented by ascetics and priests. The ultimate triumph of such views would mean not only the uprooting of distinctively Christian culture, but also the entire collapse of Western civilization. There are signs, however, that the heyday of materialistic views of the world and life is past, or at least passing, and that even in scientific circles the belief that behind the electric forces of which the atoms are held to be composed there is a directing and controlling Spirit—in other words a living God, the sole reality behind all appearances—is meeting with growing acceptance. Christianity and scientific humanism are

incompatible. Not, of course, that science in itself is anti-Christian, but when it is represented as more fraught with blessing for man than any religion is capable of yielding, its claims must be repudiated by all who hold the Christian faith. For, what do these claims amount to? Nothing less than the power of man to create his own paradise, and to be the architect of his own salvation. This, too, is plainly the idea behind the Communism of which the Russian Soviet is the leading exponent. Its whole outlook and fanatical organizations constitute a frankly "anti-God" campaign. The issue between Christianity and this growingly formidable rival throughout the Far East is as clear-cut as that between Elijah and the priests of Baal. In the spiritual realm to-day the only choice is between Jesus Immanuel, King of righteousness and Prince of peace, and the slavish despotism built up and maintained upon "man's inhumanity to man."



## CHAPTER II

### THE FACT OF CHRIST

By far the most important event in the world's history is the advent of Christ. His coming meant the transformation of religion, not merely as it had found expression in the various forms of paganism specified above,<sup>1</sup> but also as represented in Judaism, from which the new faith directly sprang. In the latter case the labours of the rabbis and the worship of the synagogue have indeed secured for it a kind of mummified existence even up till now, but its real vitality could not survive the onslaught of its own nursling, Paul of Tarsus.

The fact of Christ is the essential background of the NT Epistles. Apart from this they could not have been written at all, for herein lies their very *raison d'être*. It is at once the background, foreground, and centre of the joint picture which they present. The writers' minds were polarized by the contemplation of this one object : " Christ is all and in all."

What, then, is implied in the fact of Christ ? More perhaps than many Christians are apt to think. At the outset we are met by the declaration in certain passages of the Epistles of His pre-existence from all eternity. More obviously than the transcendental element, how-

<sup>1</sup> The teaching of Confucius and the religion of Egypt scarcely come into the picture. The former is, strictly speaking, not a religion, but an ethical code, and the latter in great part a rather unintelligible jumble of priestcraft and an irrational superstition in which magical ceremonies, animal worship, and the cult of the dead played a leading part. As Dean Inge remarks, " The Egyptian religion never inculcated a very robust or elevated morality. . . . Its power lay in its charm and in the hope of immortality."—*The Philosophy of Plotinus*, i. p. 41.

ever, there comes into the reckoning the historic Jesus, and to this aspect of the subject must be added still further the Christian's experience of Christ, the ever-living Redeemer. In the fact of Christ there is thus involved a threefold series of constituent elements—a fact of pre-existence, a fact of history, and a fact of experience.

### I. A FACT OF PRE-EXISTENCE

That Paul clearly affirms the pre-existence of Christ Jesus in the heavenly state seems sufficiently obvious from the statements of Col 1<sup>15ff.</sup> and Ph 2<sup>6ff.</sup> In the former of these passages He is described as "the image of the invisible God, first-born of all the creation," etc. This is in effect an expanded form of 1 Co 8<sup>6</sup>, where He is represented as the sole agent in creation ("one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things"), and therefore as existing before it. In face of the Colossian drift towards the worship of angels, it emphasizes the superiority of the risen Christ to all celestial powers before His incarnation: through Him indeed as the natural Head they were called into being, and our acceptance of Him as Lord is thus necessarily to acquiesce in a relation grounded in creation itself. In this passage, too, we meet with the striking conception of a cosmic Christ. The conviction that the whole universe is permeated by the love of God was firmly implanted in the apostle's mind. He was acutely conscious that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now"—a pessimism from which, however, "we are saved by hope" (Ro 8<sup>22ff.</sup>). To this persuasion of the boundless reach of God's love is ultimately to be traced the stress laid by him on the pre-mundane activities of Christ. The other *locus classicus*, Ph 2<sup>6ff.</sup>, declares that in the Incarnation, out of His deep concern for others, Christ laid aside not indeed His constitutional equality with God, nor the Divine self-consciousness, but

only the form of God (*μορφῇ Θεοῦ*), or the Divine mode of existence. In His humiliation He "emptied Himself" of the Divine glory,<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* of perfect resemblance to God, "by taking the nature of a servant; born in human guise and appearing in human form, He stooped in His obedience even to die, and to die upon the cross." Here His human abasement, His sublime condescension as the historic Christ, is not more decisively expressed than is His pre-human glory. The apostle is not teaching the doctrine of two distinct natures—his object is not to discuss mysteries concerning the Divine nature and the human—but simply stating that by the assumption of flesh the pre-existent Christ "humbled himself" and obediently trod the way of the cross. Those remarkable pronouncements by the apostle plainly imply pre-existence.<sup>2</sup> Upon this they essentially depend, and not apart from this are they really intelligible.

Other passages that come into the reckoning are Gal 4<sup>7</sup>: "When the time had fully expired God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born subject to Law, to ransom those who were under the Law"; and Ro 8<sup>3</sup>: "God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, to deal with sin, condemned sin in the flesh." In this charter of salvation the mission of the Son presupposes His existence prior to His human birth, and furthermore it implies that the premundane life of Christ was one of Sonship and spirit in contrast with that of His historical manifestation, which meant subjection to law and the assumption of flesh. Beyschlag considers that the *sending* of the Son of God does not of itself attest

<sup>1</sup> Weizsäcker agrees that these words establish two results: "In the first place, He had a personal existence before His human birth, and in the second, His earlier life was divine and absolutely opposed to the dependent life of man upon earth."—*The Apostolic Age*, i. p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> Beyschlag's attempt (*NT Theol.* i. p. 76 ff.) to explain these passages as not inconsistent with his theory that the pre-existence of Christ is "simply the concrete form given to an ideal conception" is not convincing.

pre-existence, as it may signify simply a causing to be born, but admits that in view of the apostle's clearly expressed thought of Him as a pre-existent being (Col 1<sup>15</sup>, etc.) it is probable that these passages should be understood in the same sense.<sup>1</sup>

Although Paul teaches the subordination of Christ to the Father (1 Co 11<sup>3</sup>, 15<sup>28</sup>), this does not in his estimate derogate from His essential Deity as affirmed, *e.g.* in Col 2<sup>9</sup>: "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead in a bodily way." As Kennedy puts it: "Paul brought with him into the Christian Church his convinced monotheism. And even his high Christology never detracted from that."<sup>2</sup> The two points of view cohere together, and are interdependently united by a tie too subtle for us to unravel. It may, however, be remarked that in the title "Son of God" (Ro 1<sup>2</sup>; 2 Co 1<sup>19</sup>; Gal 2<sup>20</sup>) the ideas of Christ's divinity and subordination to God are jointly reflected, and that in this way "it supplied some sort of solution to the problem which the elevation of Christ to the throne of Deity raised for the Apostle's monotheistic faith."<sup>3</sup>

There is no substantial reason for the supposition that these Pauline statements were influenced by the Philonic idea of a pre-existent supernatural "heavenly man," and that this forms the germ of the apostle's conception of Christ. Such a notion is quite out of keeping with 1 Co 15<sup>44</sup>, where the reference is to the exalted, not to the pre-existent Christ. On the general question, too, regarding foreign influence upon the Pauline conception of creation and of Christ in the

<sup>1</sup> According to Beyschlag (and as against Weizsäcker), "less value and importance attach to the passages 1 Co 10<sup>4, 5</sup>. The question arises whether in the first 'that rock was Christ' is more than an allegorizing reflexion, and whether in the second κύριον should be read instead of χριστός and applied to God" (*op. cit.*, ii. 78. Cf. also i. 252).

<sup>2</sup> *The Theology of the Epistles*, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 57.

universe a similar conclusion appears to be warranted. In some quarters it is held that the NT statements relative to the pre-existent life of Christ are merely a symbolic representation of His unique greatness; in others, that as the idea was current in post-exilic Judaism and associated with the Messiah who was waiting in heaven to be revealed (1 En 62<sup>7</sup>; 2 (4) Ezra 12<sup>32</sup>, 13<sup>26</sup>), this led to its adoption in Christian circles as peculiarly applicable to Him in whom the Messianic hopes had been realized; in others still, that it arose through the impact upon Jewish thought of the Greek conception of a transcendent God whose relations to men were conditioned by some such intermediary being as the Philonic Logos, to whom analogues were easily found in the OT titles of the "Word" and the "Wisdom" of God. In this way, it is alleged, faith in Christ came to be bound up with belief in His pre-existence and with the ascription to Him in His pre-mundane life of the attributes of Deity. According to each of these theories the doctrine has been intellectually evolved under the stimulus of contemporary speculative thought. The metaphysics of the Christological problem is a topic outwith our scope: what concerns us here is to point out the unsatisfactory nature of the theory that Paul's was virtually a borrowed theology. That he derived his ideas of Christ's pre-existence and of creation from Philo or from the Stoics remains an unproved hypothesis. For him Christ is the central principle which unifies the cosmos, and it is noteworthy that nowhere in his epistles is He designated Logos. There was perhaps a special reason for this. In view of the activities of keen Judaizers, the spread of wild speculations, of angel-worship and other religious aberrations at Colossæ, the apostle in this instance at least may have deliberately refrained from employing the term. Anyhow, it may be confidently asserted that he makes no use of ideas which have not originated

through his own experience of the risen Christ, and that his thought is not swayed by borrowed material. Even though parallels to his language occur in the Hellenistic Book of Wisdom and in the apocalyptic Book of Enoch, it is not from either of these sources, but from his whole conception of the Divine nature and from his experience of the glorified Christ that he derives his doctrine of the eternally pre-existent Son. That doctrine had for him an independent value of its own, apart from either Greek speculation or Jewish suggestion. His own inner conviction gave him assurance of the pre-temporal existence of the exalted Christ. In the contrast drawn in Ro 10 between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith there is, however, a significant point of contrast with Jewish thought. The name of Christ is substituted for the Law (Ro 10<sup>6f</sup>. compared with Dt 30<sup>12-14</sup>). The word of the gospel, he asserts, has been brought to men not as the result of any painstaking effort on their part, but simply as the voluntary act of the pre-existent Christ who, "though he was rich, yet . . . became poor" (2 Co 8<sup>9</sup>).

While not a great deal is said in the NT Epistles about the preincarnate life of Christ, this nevertheless finds clear expression not only in Paul's letters, but in other epistles as well. The statement of 1 Jn 3<sup>5</sup>: "He appeared to take our sins away," implies that He existed before His manifestation as directly affirmed in Jn 17<sup>5</sup>: "The glory which I had with thee before the world was." The real existence of Christ in heaven previous to His appearance in human guise seems clearly indicated also in 1 Pet 1<sup>20</sup>, which speaks of Him as "verily foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times." By some, indeed, it is held that only an ideal pre-existence of Christ is implied, because the same language is used of Christians (1<sup>2</sup>), because by "manifestation" is meant simply Christ's becoming known as Messianic Redeemer,

and because the expression " Spirit of Christ " is used in this chapter both of the person whose Spirit inspired the prophets and of the same person who suffered (1<sup>11</sup>). But in reply to this it has to be said that believers are never referred to as first " foreknown " and then " manifested." Moreover, there is no incongruity between the reference to the Divine Spirit as inspiring the prophets and as afterwards bestowed upon Christ in His human life. Nor surely was there any need for the writer to explain that in the one case he was speaking of the pre-existent Christ and in the other of the historic Jesus. The notable passage, 1 Pet 3<sup>18-20</sup>, concerning Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison, has also a bearing upon this subject. Whether or not it is to be understood as asserting that, in the interval between His crucifixion and resurrection, He preached salvation in Hades to the antediluvian world, it certainly does indicate that His existence did not begin with His birth at Bethlehem. His incarnation was only the manifestation to men of His eternal Presence as the Son of God who had " in spirit " been always, though invisibly, at work in the world. Truly regarded, the passage testifies to the pre-existence of the Christ, and herein, viewed from our particular angle, lies its real significance.

Notable also in this connexion is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Specially impressive are the opening verses (1<sup>1-4</sup>), which unequivocally assert the personal pre-existence of the Son as an intermediary being between God and the world.<sup>1</sup> It was by Him that God created the world (1<sup>2</sup>; cf. Col 1<sup>6</sup>). Again, " He became partaker of flesh and blood," and " took on him the seed of Abraham " (1<sup>14, 16</sup>) — statements which point to a previous existence. In this epistle, too, as well as in the Pauline letters, there is along with the distinct

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 En 48<sup>6</sup>, where it is said of the Messiah: " He was chosen and hidden with God before the creation of the world."

declaration of the essential Deity of Christ an assertion of His subordination to God the Father. On the one hand He is represented as the creator of the universe and the mediator of the relation between created things and God, and on the other He is portrayed as dependent on the Father "for his appointment as heir of all things ( $\text{r}^2$ ), for calling as high-priest ( $5^5$ ), for resurrection ( $\text{r}3^{20}$ ), for exaltation ( $\text{r}^{13}$ )."<sup>1</sup> No adequate solution of this antinomy has yet been arrived at,<sup>2</sup> but the Christian consciousness must acknowledge the truth of both conceptions. With the belief that in Christ Jesus God is essentially and personally present is somehow bound up that of an actual eternal pre-existence; but as it is equally true that His mission has to be fulfilled under temporal conditions, He must needs appear to the eye of faith from the point of view of His earthly incarnation as well as *sub specie æternitatis*.

In so far, then, as the NT, and especially the Pauline Epistles, refer to the pre-existing Christ, He is represented as having lived a personal life and as sharing the form and attributes of God. For Him and by Him the world was created and is sustained (Col  $\text{r}^{17}$ ). When the apostle describes Him as "the first-born of all creation" (Col  $\text{r}^{15}$ ), the meaning is not that He was Himself a created being, but merely that He existed before any created thing was extant, and that dominion is properly due to Him as the first-born.

Various attempts have been made to explain Paul's conception of the mode of Christ's pre-existent life. These, however, are either purely speculative or contrary to the apostle's own teaching. We have seen that the idea of Him as a heavenly man derives no support from

<sup>1</sup> H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ*, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> According to Beyschlag indeed, "the two sides of the Son's equality with God and subjection to God are for the author (of the Epistle to the Hebrews) united in the image of the archetypal Man who is to lead many brethren to glory."—*Op. cit.* ii. p. 312.



1 Co 15<sup>45-47</sup>. Nor is there any reason to suppose with some that already in His pre-existent life Christ was the God-man in a spiritual body. Such an idea is quite inconsistent with the apostle's language with respect to His humiliation. His having been made "in the likeness (or form) of men" is not put forward as a description of His original state, but as a declaration of what took place when He came into the world. Others, founding on the identification of the Son with the Spirit in 2 Co 3<sup>17</sup>, hold that in Paul's view no differentiation was made between them as members of the Godhead, but this is to ignore the fact that elsewhere he represents the Holy Ghost as equally concerned with the Father and the Son in the work of men's salvation (2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>).

Although the statements in the Epistles with reference to the pre-existence of Christ cannot reasonably be ignored, it must frankly be recognized that they carry us into a region transcending human experience. They present an aspect of Christology which is distinctly metaphysical, and so hard to be understood that the early Church Fathers in treating them as sources for a definite dogmatic construction of the Person of Christ were only ploughing the sands. It is, however, quite evident from the casual way in which for the most part they allude to it, that the NT writers took for granted the familiarity of their readers with the notion of pre-existence as applied to the Messiah, and considered it unnecessary to expatiate upon it.

## 2. A FACT OF HISTORY

For our present design it is important to realize that it does not lie within the scope of the Epistles to narrate the circumstances of the Saviour's earthly life. They are essentially a group of occasional letters addressed to various Christian communities already familiar with the story of His life, and dealing with special

situations and questions which had arisen. Their purpose is not to convey information concerning the salient facts of His historical manifestation. Everywhere the writers proceed upon the assumption that their readers are acquainted with those facts. What they have chiefly in view is to urge upon them the importance of so ordering their lives that their whole conversation should be such as becometh the quite definitely known gospel of Christ (Ph 1<sup>27</sup>).

In the Pauline writings especially it would be unreasonable to expect much allusion to the earthly life of Jesus. Paul was not one of those chosen to be "with Him." The NT stresses the importance of continuous eye-witnessing in the case of evangelists (Lk 1<sup>4</sup>) and apostles (Ac 1<sup>21f.</sup>) alike. For these offices the most essential qualification was that of having witnessed the acts and heard the sayings of Jesus. That is to say, the centre of interest was the historical fact of Jesus of Nazareth, who suffered death under Pontius Pilate "outside the Gate" (Heb 13<sup>12</sup>); and none were so fit to satisfy inquiries regarding His history as those who had "companied" with Him. Paul's case, however, was exceptional. His first direct contact with the Christ was when the risen Lord had appeared to him on his persecuting errand to Damascus and called him to be an apostle (Ac 9<sup>17</sup>, etc.; 1 Co 15<sup>8f.</sup>). From the hour of that vision, realizing that the crucified was identical with the glorified Jesus, he became His devoted disciple. Moreover, apart from this striking revelation of Jesus as Lord, it has to be recognized that from what he had learned in various quarters before, he must have been well informed with respect to the leading events of the Saviour's earthly career. His acquaintance with the historical tradition concerning Jesus, which probably moulded his doctrinal teaching to an extent not generally recognized, is evidenced by his statements in connexion with the

institution of the Last Supper (1 Co 11) and with His resurrection (1 Co 15). From his allusion to "the night in which He was betrayed" (1 Co 11<sup>23</sup>), and to the successive appearances of Jesus after His resurrection; from his reference to the Lord's teaching about marriage (1 Co 7<sup>10. 25</sup>); from his declaration "by the word of the Lord" regarding the future resurrection of believers (1 Thess 4<sup>15</sup>); and from his quotation of the Master's saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Ac 20<sup>35</sup>), it is reasonable to conclude that the apostle was neither ignorant of, nor reckoned as trivial, the general trend of His earthly career. That some of these sayings are not contained in the Gospels in no way detracts from their authority. Although, too, he was "an apostle not of men, neither by man" (Gal 1<sup>1</sup>), this is not inconsistent with his having received many historical details regarding the life of Jesus from Peter, with whom he tarried a fortnight in Jerusalem for the express purpose of interviewing him (*ἱστορήσαι*, Gal 1<sup>18</sup>). Certainly at this stage, when he was obliged to cease from his three years' ministry at Damascus, he urgently needed the best advice regarding his future steps in the service of the Master. He may further have obtained valuable information from James, the brother of the Lord and head of the Church of Jerusalem, whom he met with during that visit (Gal 1<sup>18f.</sup>), as well as on a later occasion (Gal. ii. 1), from John, who also was in repute as one of the "pillars" of the Church (Gal 2<sup>9</sup>). There were, too, many brethren still surviving who, as eye-witness, were conversant with the facts, and to whom the risen Lord had appeared (1 Co. 15<sup>6</sup>). Intercourse with these, it may reasonably be presumed, would prove a fruitful source of enlightenment to one so keenly interested as the apostle. Nor is it to be forgotten that even before he became a Christian his activity as a persecutor, and in particular the hearing of the witness borne by the martyr Stephen (Ac 758,

22<sup>20</sup>), must have familiarized him to a large extent with the story and the teaching of Jesus. He chose, however, to stress the facts of cardinal importance for salvation—Christ's voluntary humiliation as the suffering and sinless Messiah, His death and burial, His resurrection and appearances to many witnesses, and His supreme exaltation—rather than to take account of minor episodes in His life. Finally, in this connexion, it may be asked what we are to understand by his own statement that he had known Him after the flesh (2 Co 5<sup>16</sup>). From these words some scholars infer that Paul had seen and possibly even heard and conversed with Jesus during His appearances in the Holy City (cf. 1 Co 9<sup>1</sup>). The meaning, however, is probably rather that formerly he knew Him only "according to flesh-standard" (Meyer). In sharp contrast to this there follows the further assertion, "Yet now henceforth know we Him (so) no more." That amounts to a claim that he had now come to know Him, not simply as a human personality, but in a higher and more spiritual sense as Saviour and Lord Christ.<sup>1</sup> By this antithesis the apostle would seem to indicate that in point of religious importance the present life of Christ exceeds all ascertainable knowledge concerning the earthly situation of Jesus of Nazareth, and that in the religious life the merely historical is but of secondary value, the prime requisite here being fellowship in spirit with the living Lord (Ro 1<sup>4</sup>).<sup>2</sup> Such knowledge is not based upon the limitations of His human appearance. For the apostle the knowledge of Him in that aspect ceased when it pleased God to reveal His Son in him (Gal 1<sup>16</sup>). For every disciple Paul regards the pre-Christian state as annulled through his union with Christ; the entire

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the reference in 2 Co 12<sup>1</sup> to the sight of the glorified Jesus.

<sup>2</sup> To know Christ after the flesh does not, however, involve such a minimizing of the importance of the historical Jesus as is suggested by Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 399.

spiritual nature is transfigured and has become new (2 Co 5<sup>17</sup>), so that he is one with Christ through His indwelling Spirit (Ro 8<sup>9f.</sup>).

That Paul was no stranger to the historical tradition about Jesus is matter of legitimate deduction from the evidence adduced. Naturally, however, what impressed him as the result of his presumably prolonged meditation in the silence of the Arabian desert was not so much the story of the separate incidents in the earthly life of the Saviour as its profound significance for the regeneration of humanity. He envisages the appearance of Jesus as a whole rather than in detail, and, casting aside the narrow trammels of Judaism, aims at a comprehensive view of the world's history as beginning and ending in God.<sup>1</sup> The overwhelming power with which this great conception of the world's redemption, effected through the operation of Divine Wisdom in history, came home to him, finds expression in a declaration which sums up his whole philosophy of the historic Jesus: "Of God He is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and holiness and redemption" (1 Co 1<sup>30</sup>).

Although there can be no question about Peter's acquaintance with the events in the ministry of Jesus, it is worth notice that in his First Epistle there are several obvious reminiscences of the Master. In these passages it is impossible not to discern a distinct reflexion of the Saviour's own utterances. The words of Cephas illustrate at least the objective reality of the life and doctrines of Jesus as a fact of history.

As has been already said, it was not the aim of the writers of the NT Letters to chronicle in detail the events in the life of Jesus. Yet in these writings there is no lack of allusion to the basic historical facts of the Christian gospel. Thus, concerning the manifestation of Christ, it is declared by one apostle that "God was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. this with the Apocalyptic point of view, on which see T. R. Glover, *Paul of Tarsus*, ch. x.

manifest in the flesh " (Gal 4<sup>4</sup>), and by another that " the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us " (1 Jn 1<sup>2</sup>). That the human personality of Jesus is likewise strongly emphasised in the Epistle to the Hebrews is vouched for by the statements that He partook of flesh and blood (2<sup>14</sup>), called men his brethren (2<sup>12. 17</sup>), and " with bitter cries and tears offered prayers and supplications to Him who was able to save him from death " (5<sup>7</sup>)—a direct allusion to Gethsemane. So, too, when the writer speaks of Jesus having suffered outside the Gate (13<sup>12</sup>), he is referring to Calvary.

It is of cardinal significance that this collective testimony to the Incarnation is accompanied by the assertion of the sinlessness of Jesus, for this must ever rank as an essential factor in His gospel. Paul expressly affirms that He had no personal experience of sin (2 Co 5<sup>21</sup>), and in complete unison with this pronouncement is the equally pointed Johannine statement: " In Him there is no sin " (1 Jn 3<sup>5</sup>). This is borne out also by the identical tribute of Peter in the phrase, " who did no sin " (1 Pet 2<sup>22</sup>). With these testimonies agrees that of the writer to the Hebrews that " He was in all points tempted like as we are without sinning " (4<sup>15</sup>). Jesus is thus portrayed in the NT Epistles not only as superior in degree to all others in stainlessness, but as occupying a height of moral excellence absolutely unique, and such as to constitute Him a peculiar value in history. He is described as " holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners " (7<sup>26</sup>)—epithets piled upon each other to make it clear that in His moral quality He is peerless among all who have ever worn the garment of flesh and blood. It is the unanimous verdict of the NT Epistles that " He never committed sin, but only suffered from it." <sup>1</sup> As, however, Principal Martin

<sup>1</sup> Beyschlag, *op. cit.* ii. 70.

has emphatically urged, "the sinlessness of Jesus is not to be demonstrated by an induction of facts. . . . The judgement which asserts the sinless perfection of Jesus is a judgement of faith. . . . The judgement springs out of the Christian experience, and finds a place there only. . . . Nothing is surer to faith than that He truly fills the Messianic part. He is Saviour and Lord. And for such a personage it is immediately involved that He must needs be free from sin. . . . This His early followers became assured of. And the assurance holds for those who follow Him still. Jesus has become their Saviour : therefore he 'knew no sin.' " <sup>1</sup>

Alongside of their testimony to the Incarnation, numerous references occur in the NT Letters to the death and resurrection of Jesus. In 1 Co 15<sup>3ff.</sup> both events are set forth in clear and impressive words : "First and foremost, I passed on to you what I had myself received, namely, that Christ died for our sins as the scriptures had said, that he was buried, that he rose on the third day as the scriptures had said, and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve ; after that, he was seen by over five hundred brothers all at once, the majority of whom survive to this day, though some have died ; after that, he was seen by James, then by all the apostles, and finally, he was seen by myself." If in many passages (*e.g.* Ro 5<sup>6, 8</sup> ; 1 Thess 5<sup>9f.</sup>, etc.) special stress is laid on the death, there are others in which it is co-ordinated with the resurrection. Thus the Christian faith is summed up in the words of 1 Thess 4<sup>14</sup> : "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again." The same conjunction occurs in 2 Co 5<sup>15</sup> : "He died for all in order to have the living live no longer for themselves, but for him who died and rose for them." So also in Ro 4<sup>25</sup> : "He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification," the death and the resurrection are represented as twin factors in the sinner's

<sup>1</sup> *The Finality of Jesus for Faith*, p. 133 ff.

redemption. In other passages still, special prominence is given to the resurrection. To the Corinthians the apostle writes: "If Christ did not rise, your faith is futile; ye are yet in your sins" (1 Co 15<sup>17</sup>), and to the Romans: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord, and believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (10<sup>9</sup>). Not, however, that special emphasis on the resurrection is at all incongruous with the stress laid by the apostle on the crucifixion. As it had been revealed to him that the glorified Jesus who had appeared to Him on the way to Damascus was one and the same with Him who had died upon the cross, the gospel of Christ crucified was also the gospel of Christ risen. It could therefore be stated in terms either of the death or of the resurrection or of both in combination.<sup>1</sup> To the same effect is the Johannine witness that "we are cleansed from all sin through the blood of Jesus, God's Son" (1 Jn 1<sup>7</sup>); that "He laid down his life for us" (1 Jn 3<sup>16</sup>); and that God "sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 Jn 4<sup>10</sup>; cf. 2<sup>2</sup>). If this epistle does not speak specifically of Christ's resurrection, it seems to be implied in 3<sup>2</sup>: "Now are we children of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." With the Pauline and Johannine testimony agrees that of Peter, in whose First Epistle frequent mention is made of "the sufferings of Christ" (1<sup>11</sup>, 2<sup>21</sup>, 24, 3<sup>18</sup>). In one of these passages it is stated that "He bore our sins in his own body upon the tree," and in the last there is the clear declaration: "Christ himself died for our sins, once for all, a just man for

<sup>1</sup> "There can be no salvation from sin unless there is a living Saviour: this explains the emphasis laid by the apostle on the Resurrection. But the Living One can only be a Saviour because He has died: this explains the emphasis laid on the Cross."—Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 123.



unjust men, that he might bring us to God: in the flesh he was put to death, but came to life in the Spirit." The Epistle to the Hebrews contains the same teaching. "We see Jesus, who was made for a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man" (2<sup>9</sup>). Through His death as a sinless being He "delivers all those who through a lifelong fear of death were subject to bondage" (2<sup>15</sup>). "Son though he was, he learned by all he suffered how to obey, and by being thus perfected he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him" (5<sup>8</sup>). He "endured the contradiction of sinners" (12<sup>3</sup>), and was crucified outside the city gate (13<sup>12</sup>). Although the writer only once mentions the resurrection (13<sup>20</sup>), he speaks pointedly of Christ's entrance into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us (9<sup>24</sup>).

There can therefore be no dubiety concerning the position of the NT Epistles relative to the death and resurrection of Jesus. The writers represent them as historical facts. And there can be as little doubt about the significance attached by them to those facts as the basis of man's redemption. The expiatory character and redemptive efficiency of Christ's death, and the resurrection as the "divine act that is the means of its appropriation," are treated as a unique intervention in history. Jesus, says Paul, in words already quoted, "was delivered up for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Ro 4<sup>25</sup>). In this way the omnipotence of God was displayed in the exercise of His love. This is the very core and essence of the gospel, and such is its dynamic force that it is "a power of salvation to every one that believeth" (Ro 1<sup>16</sup>). Of similar import is the language of the first Johannine epistle: "He was manifested to take away our sins" (3<sup>5</sup>). Twice over He is spoken of as "the propitiation for our sins" (2<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>10</sup>). With this, too, coincides the testimony of Peter: "He

bore our sins . . . that we might break with sin and live for righteousness ; and by his wounds you have been healed " (1 Pet 2<sup>24</sup>). In the Epistle to the Hebrews also the same note is struck : " Christ was once sacrificed to bear the sins of many " (9<sup>28</sup>). " He secured an eternal redemption " (9<sup>12ff.</sup>).

The facts relating to the personal life of Jesus, to His death on the cross—whereby He Himself is made unto us redemption—and to His subsequent resurrection, together point to His Person as the source of true and everlasting life. We become sure of God only through the fact of His appearance as an undoubted historical reality. In 1 Jn 4<sup>2f.</sup> it is explicitly declared that the crucial test of the possession of the Spirit of God is the confession that Jesus is the Christ incarnate, and that refusal to make this confession proceeds from the spirit of Antichrist. Plainly, the Johannine writings are based throughout upon the conviction that " the Word became flesh." As Kittel has said : " The Eternal became *Historia* ; and this *Historia* is—Jesus of Nazareth." <sup>1</sup> Similarly Herrmann : " Jesus stands before us in history claiming to be Himself alone salvation for all men." <sup>2</sup> It is indeed a stupendous claim that through the incarnation and death of Jesus, the humble carpenter of Nazareth, the eternal God stepped into history by coming to earth as the Son of Man in order " to seek and to save that which was lost." Yet the NT doctrine of the Christ is undeniably based on the historical fact that He suffered under Pontius Pilate. The crucifixion was, of course, beyond question, and any who had doubts about the resurrection were confidently referred by the apostle to eye-witnesses still living who could testify to its reality (1 Co 15<sup>6</sup>).

While the idea of salvation was widely promulgated through the myths associated with the Mystery Religions

<sup>1</sup> *Mysterium Christi*, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Communion with God*, Eng. tr., p. 77.

of the age, these myths were devoid of any historical foundation: salvation was contingent upon ritualistic observances which symbolized "the timeless verity of the myth." In strong contrast to this is the doctrine of salvation through the Christ, who is one with the Jesus of history, foretold by the prophets, and afterwards, when the time was fully come, manifested in sight of men. Primitive Christianity is inseparably bound up with the historic Jesus. Many of His contemporaries saw in Him nothing beyond a prominent figure in the life of His time, whom they regarded favourably or otherwise as the case might be; others saw in His life's activity and in His tragic death upon the cross God's "unspeakable gift" (2 Co 9<sup>15</sup>), and the world's redemption from sin (Jn 1<sup>29</sup>; Ro 3<sup>24</sup>).

The peculiar significance of the earthly career of Jesus, however, cannot be gauged *merely* by regarding it as an event of history. According to the NT it is the revelation of the truth about God, and the basis of that reconciliation between a holy God and sinful men which is spoken of as "salvation." Nay more; the claim is made that in this respect its position is exclusive and unique. In the Acts of the Apostles, Peter is reported as saying: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (4<sup>12</sup>), and this accurately sums up the teaching of the Epistles as well. While it is recognized that in the estimation of "the wisdom of this world" the preaching of the cross is sheer folly, it is at the same time firmly asserted that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men" (1 Co 1<sup>25</sup>).

Further, it is through Christ that we are first raised to fellowship with God. In Him we see God revealing Himself to us. "God makes Himself known to us, so that we may recognize Him, through a *fact*, on the strength of which we can believe on Him."<sup>1</sup> This fact

<sup>1</sup> Herrmann, *op. cit.* p. 51.

is the appearance of Jesus in history. Through Him we enter into living communion with God, in which we experience the forgiveness of sins and the opening of channels by which the Divine strength is poured into us, till from being helpless moral and spiritual paralytics we are made the possessors of inward health and a peace passing all understanding.

Historical criticism has been freely expended on the Gospel narratives with a view to arriving at a complete picture of the historic Jesus. The problem, however, can never be solved by the application of this method alone; it must be supplemented by faith. As Kittel observes: "Faith is the only possible key to the Jesus of history."<sup>1</sup> In the NT, as the same writer has forcibly pointed out, the historic Jesus and the Christ of faith and experience are so inseparably conjoined that the one is worthless without the other. Faith alone can interpret the Jesus of history as truly the living and exalted Christ, but apart from the reality of the historic Jesus the Christ of faith is nothing but a chimera, and "has no existence."

In our own day the crucial importance of the historicity of Jesus has received fresh illustration through the resignation of the well-known novelist Mrs. Pearl S. Buck as a missionary in China of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Her contention is that it matters little whether Jesus ever lived or not, and that what is essential to Christianity would remain, although to the question a negative answer should be given. "And what if He never lived?" she writes, "What of that? Whether Christ had a body or not, whether He had a time to be born in history and a time to die as other men have is no matter now; perhaps it never was any matter. What lives to-day is not the ephemeral body of flesh and bones. If once it lived, then well enough; if not, then, well too" (*Cosmopolitan* for May 1933, p. 170). This is,

<sup>1</sup> *Mysterium Christi*, p. 49.

of course, merely a popular restatement of what Dr. Warfield long ago labelled as "Christless Christianity." That Jesus actually lived, and died for our sins, and still lives to rescue us from sin's dominion, may be contested by "Modernists," but by the great mass of believing men and women anything else must be regarded as "just no Christianity at all." So widely and strongly is this conviction held that the resignation of the famous novelist, though naïvely camouflaged as a regretful acquiescence in her request to be released from active connexion with the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, had clearly become inevitable in view of the widespread dissatisfaction aroused. The question at issue is no mere academic one; it touches religious life at the very root, and really leads back to the basic question, What is Christianity?

### 3. A FACT OF EXPERIENCE

The main purpose of the letters addressed to the primitive churches by the apostles was avowedly to bear witness to the Incarnation, with a view to their readers sharing in their fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ (1 Jn 1<sup>1-3</sup>), and moulding their lives accordingly (Ph 1<sup>27</sup>). Most of all, therefore, do the Epistles lay stress upon this experimental fellowship. They are written from the standpoint that what men need supremely is a Jesus they can live. Broadly speaking, this was the chief object of the various writers. Yet it has to be recognized that they were men differing in respect of individual temperament, mental characteristics, and religious experience. Thus Peter is the impersonation of a spirit of hopefulness in his presentation of the gospel as at once the fulfilment of prophecy and the guarantee of a glorious inheritance "reserved in heaven" for the people of God. Paul's strong intellectuality radiates from his acute reasoning and the gathering momentum by which his conclusions

are reached. As pre-eminently the mystic among "the Twelve," John stands "at gaze before a few sublime verities and their Satanic contrasts."<sup>1</sup> James stresses the duty of being "doers of the word, and not hearers only." Special features of the Epistles are due also to the circumstances of those to whom they were addressed. Peter's message of hope is peculiarly suited to cheer the down-trodden and despondent. Paul had to defend his position in face of persistent opposition from Jews and Judaizing Christians. On occasion John felt constrained to exchange his calmly contemplative mood for a vigorous assertion of the divine and human attributes of the crucified Jesus. And the practical cast of the Epistle of James may not improbably in part at least have been caused by the loose morality of his readers. The religious experience through which the several writers had passed has also to be reckoned as an important factor in the shaping of their epistles. Himself a convert to the Christian faith, Paul gives prominence to what is essential in creed and conduct if the gospel is to become "the power of God unto salvation." John, again, appears to have come through no such inward struggles as Paul experienced, but rather to have quietly grown in grace, and to have been gently wafted toward the spiritual serenity reflected in his words.

#### (I) THE PAULINE EPISTLES

By way of illustration we turn first to some leading phases of the spiritual experience of the great apostle of the Gentiles as reflected in his letters to the churches which were the fruit of his labours. Among these are to be reckoned :

(a) *His Position with Reference to the Jewish Law.*—Through his conversion-experience Paul had discovered that hitherto as a Pharisee he had been on the wrong

<sup>1</sup> W. P. Paterson, *The Apostles' Teaching*, Part i. p. 8.

track. Formerly he had regarded the law as the medium of salvation ; now he perceived and maintained against the Judaizers that Christ was the end of the law for righteousness (Ro 10<sup>4</sup>), redemption from its curse having been effected through His death for our sins "according to the scriptures" (1 Co 15<sup>3</sup>). By thus bearing the penalty attaching to its transgression the Sinless One as our representative satisfied the law's demands and freed the sinner from its jurisdiction. In the fulness of time "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal 4<sup>4f.</sup>). When this took place, the validity of the law ceased. The reign of law was displaced by that of grace, the religion of conformity to ceremonial enactments by one of filial freedom, the servitude of the former age by the gospel of the new. Now, therefore, Paul had broken with his past, and in the light of his new-found treasure had completely reversed his sense of values, his view of what was gain and what was loss (Ph 3<sup>5-7</sup>). In doing so he did not repudiate the OT revelation of God, but from his altered standpoint, while still recognizing the law as holy and spiritual (Ro 7<sup>12, 14</sup>), he denied that the strictest observance of its ceremonial requirements could secure salvation. The impotence of the law in this respect has been proved by experience. No more than had the light of conscience among the Gentiles (Ro 2<sup>14f.</sup>) had the practice of the Mosaic law among the Jews met the divine requirements. Only by its perfect fulfilment could its curse be escaped (Gal 3<sup>10</sup>), but this was never achieved because it was "weak through the flesh" (Ro 8<sup>3</sup>). It had failed. There was, however, no essential contradiction between the fact that the law was divinely instituted and that it proved a failure notwithstanding. After all, it was merely a temporary stage in the spiritual education of man. Its authority was destined to be abrogated when men

should be freed from its dominion by the body of Christ (Ro 7<sup>4</sup>).

It is important to note further that while the law could not bring salvation, it could prepare men's hearts to receive it, by fostering in them a sense of helplessness, sin, and misery, and a disposition to welcome divine deliverance. For what was its real purpose in the mind of God? "It was added," says Paul, "because of transgressions," to multiply offences (Ro 5<sup>20</sup>; Gal 3<sup>19</sup>). The OT Scriptures prove that though the written law could teach men God's will it could not by the works it enjoined enable them to satisfy Him (Ro 3<sup>19ff.</sup>). While scribal legalism represented an attempt on man's part to establish his own righteousness (Ro 10<sup>3</sup>), the only righteousness attainable is that of faith, which Abraham achieved centuries before Moses lived (Gn 15<sup>6</sup>). With Paul it was axiomatic that "by the works of the law no person shall be justified in God's sight" (Gal 2<sup>16</sup>), for no one could say that he had perfectly kept it. Law can reveal sin, but not remove it. That method, the method of "works," has failed. Righteousness must be sought elsewhere; a new method of deliverance must be found, and has been found in "the faith of Christ." In the estimation of the apostle the love of the crucified Jesus transcends all law. From his own inner experience he had learned that the great and divinely ordained purpose of the law was to arouse the consciousness of sin (Ro 3<sup>20</sup>, 7<sup>7</sup>). "The law was our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal 3<sup>24</sup>). Not that the Christian salvation is thereby divested of an ethical character. On the contrary, through Christ's death and resurrection the moral position has been so transformed as to create for the first time the possibility of a truly righteous life (Ro 6<sup>3ff.</sup>). For the believer new motives, too, have come into play, notably the constraining love of Christ



(2 Co 5<sup>14</sup>). Moreover, according to the testimony of the apostle, the capacity for the new life is conferred through the effective operation of the Spirit : " The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death " (Ro 8<sup>2ff.</sup>).

(b) *His Experience of the Power of Sin and of its Removal through the Gift of God in Christ.*—Nothing could be more vivid or impressive than the delineation in Ro 7 of the baleful consequences of sin. The picture, obviously autobiographical, is that of one reduced to slavery. " The law is spiritual : but I am carnal " ; " sold under sin " ; " what I hate that I do " . . . " so this is my experience of the law, that when I would do good, evil is present " . . . " O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ? " The solution came through realization of freedom from the law, and the discovery that " where sin abounded, grace did much more abound " (Ro 5<sup>20</sup>). It was given him to know that while " the wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord " (Ro 6<sup>23</sup>), and that " there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus " (Ro 8<sup>1</sup>). The recognition of this fills him with a devout wonder. Fully sensible that he has failed in the arduous struggle to be righteous before God, he is amazed at the marvel of the divine forgiveness. In joyous reaction from his former despairing cry, to which he has found so conclusive an answer, he exclaims : " Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift " (2 Co 9<sup>15</sup>), and again : " I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Ro 7<sup>25</sup>). At the same time there was evidently no diminution in his consciousness of sin. For Paul, sin and conscience are great realities woven into the texture of all his thought. His splendid loyalty to conscience (Ac 23<sup>1</sup>, 24<sup>16</sup>) and his overwhelming sense of sin are twin factors in moulding his religious conceptions and in shaping his life. In all this we see reflected his Christian experience in its

earliest phases—his acute sense of the subtle power and crushing bondage of sin, the certitude of his rescue from its dominion through the still greater power of the Lord Jesus, and the expression of his gratitude to God. Clearly, then, it is Paul's conviction that salvation is due entirely to the grace of God in Christ. There is no room in his conception for the idea that any inherent ability in man is a contributory factor. Neither can redemption be viewed as merely "the satisfaction of a metaphysical affinity between the spirit of man and God, in virtue of which the divine spark or germ comes to its rights."<sup>1</sup> Equally vain is it to attempt to trace it to such nebulous absorption in the divine as that entertained by the Mystery Religions. It is purely the outcome of God's free grace. The Pauline claim is that salvation depends on this "gift of grace" (Ro 5<sup>15</sup>) and man's believing acceptance of it. This is attested by many passages in his epistles, *e.g.* 2 Co 8<sup>9</sup>: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be enriched, and (on the assumption of its Pauline authorship) Eph 2<sup>8</sup>: "By grace are ye saved, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." According to Paul, then, salvation requires for its appropriation nothing but faith. His is emphatically the evangelical standpoint, namely, that the Christian religion knows nothing of a slavish bondage to any legalistic code, but is distinctively one of grace and freedom.

At the same time the apostle's experience makes it plain that grace thus imparted and responded to becomes an enabling power in the life. Thus, in 1 Co 15<sup>10</sup>, he writes: "By the grace of God I am what I am: and, his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." In

<sup>1</sup> Moffatt, *Grace in the NT.*

this we have the record of an outstanding example of what Charles Wesley aptly calls "the triumphs of His grace." Similar recognition of the source of power in the Christian life finds expression in Ph 4<sup>13</sup>: "In him who strengthens me I am able for anything." This infusion of moral strength empowering him to face every situation as it arose, Paul avowedly owed directly and entirely to his Lord. It was not the fruit of his own human capacity, but of the enabling power referred to in 1 Timothy (which, if not Paul's, is at least Pauline) with reference to his being "put into the ministry" (1<sup>12ff.</sup>). In every emergency of that service "the Lord stood by me and strengthened me," is the testimony borne in 2 Tim 4<sup>17</sup>. Such in the apostle's experience was the life-giving and morally dynamic force imparted by the risen Lord. He has put on record the divine answer to his prayer to be relieved of his thorn in the flesh: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness" (2 Co 12<sup>9</sup>). "For Christ's sake," and "that the power of Christ might rest upon him," he was even ready to "glory in his infirmities," and, making use of a striking antithesis, declared that he was strong just when he was weak. Through his fellowship with Christ and in the strength of His might he had reached the acme of moral power, and was equal to whatever demands might be made upon him, and ready not only to bear but to welcome trial. If our tribulations are often the last things we bring into the song, this only brands our fellowship with Christ as of an order inferior to that of the apostle, and shews that we have not yet experienced the fulness of His transforming power.

(c) *His Strong Assertion of Christian Freedom.*—This was being endangered by the practice of Peter, who, previous to the arrival at Antioch of "certain that came from Judæa" had eaten with Gentiles, but then "withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who

were of the circumcision" (Gal 2<sup>12ff.</sup>). The Pauline claim arose, therefore, in connexion with the relation of Christians to the law. Viewing it as a body of precepts which, in their totality, constituted "a unity and a system"<sup>1</sup> (Gal 5<sup>3</sup>; cf. Ja 2<sup>10</sup>), Paul affirms that it placed a grievous burden on those who lived under it. According to the narrative in the Acts (15<sup>10</sup>), Peter himself, after Paul's rebuke, came frankly to acknowledge this. In the Galatian epistle, of which "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free" (5<sup>1</sup>) is really the central note, Paul brings forward the argument from experience. As one who had himself lived under the law, and striven to obey its precepts to the utmost, he emphatically declares its yoke to be a cruel oppression, "the yoke of bondage."<sup>2</sup> The emancipation from its fetters effected by the Christian belief he presents in a variety of aspects, namely, as redemption, justification, adoption, life, freedom, blessedness, and the reception of the Spirit.<sup>3</sup> By the apostle these are employed as practically equivalent terms to represent *in cumulo* the great deliverance wrought through Christ. Its depth and comprehensiveness fully warrant the challenge: "Did ye receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" There could be only one answer. It has been said that "liberty is a word which has lost its magic," but "our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus" is not yet out of date. In the estimation of the apostle it is a perennial source of delight. The possession of the free morality experienced as the result of emancipation from the bondage of the law fills the soul of the individual Christian with an exhilarating and grateful joy, a gladness of

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Christian Freedom*, p. 251 (1st ed.).

<sup>2</sup> This is denied by Herford, who does not hesitate to say that Paul misrepresents the effect of the Torah.

<sup>3</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *op. cit.* p. 266, where these terms are discussed *seriatim*.

heart surpassing every other inward satisfaction, and leading on to the Jerusalem which is above, and is free (Gal 4<sup>26</sup>). All who are her children can join in the song :

Jesus, our only joy be Thou,  
As Thou our prize wilt be ;  
Jesus, be Thou our glory now,  
And through eternity.

(d) *His Sense of the Supreme Significance of Christ's Death.*—This calls for special emphasis as the basis of all his preaching and writing. "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" is his declaration to the Galatians (6<sup>14</sup>). In like manner he writes to the church at Corinth : "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Co 2<sup>2</sup>). The same estimate of the fundamental importance of Christ's death characterizes his letters throughout. There is no reason to think that in his view of its significance, as expressed in his later epistles, Paul in any way deviates from that given in the earlier. On this great theme, from first to last, he speaks with one voice. Uniformly he adheres to that belief that Christ "gave himself for our sins" (Gal 1<sup>4</sup>), "died for our sins" (1 Co 15<sup>3</sup>), as the central and essential message of the Gospel. Precisely indeed because of its significance for *sinner*s does the death of Christ constitute in his view its very substance. For him there is no other Gospel than that of redemption from sin through the cross of Christ, and consequent initiation into the Christian life and fellowship with God. In this he is strictly adhering to what he had received from the Lord Himself (1 Co 11<sup>23</sup>), and had been transmitted to him through living church tradition (1 Co 15<sup>3</sup>). For Paul, then, Christ's death is essentially related to sin. Sin had exposed all men to death (2 Co 5<sup>14</sup>) and could be expiated only by Christ's taking responsibility for it upon Himself. In order to bear our sin, and bear it away, He had to die our death. This was the

"price" with which we were bought (1 Co 6<sup>20</sup>, 7<sup>23</sup>)—a fact strikingly bound up with the Sacraments, in which we are brought directly into relation with the Christ who by one wonderful and inexpressible act, the sacrifice of Himself upon the cross, made atonement for sin, and thus paved the way for the preaching of "the word of reconciliation" (2 Co 5<sup>19</sup>). The apostle also represents the death of Christ as the crowning proof of the love of God (Ro 5<sup>8</sup>). The death of the Son is thus interpreted through the love of the Father. In the mind of the apostle it is likewise conceived as the love which animated Christ Himself. "The Son of God loved me," he writes, "and gave himself for me" (Gal 2<sup>20</sup>). In the mighty task of redemption He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Ph 2<sup>8</sup>; Ro 5<sup>19</sup>). In all this we have the key to the pronouncement: "We preach Christ crucified" (1 Co 1<sup>23</sup>).

(e) *His Sense of the Universality and Levelling Nature of Christianity.*—To this, vigorous expression is given in Col 3<sup>11</sup>: "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." The Gospel, in fact, is for every man. From the account of his conversion ascribed to Paul himself in Ac 26<sup>16ff.</sup> (cf. Ac 9<sup>15</sup>) we learn that he had been divinely chosen as an ambassador for Christ to those outside the pale of the Church, and the commission already given to himself was publicly announced by the Holy Ghost at a solemn dedication service in Antioch (Ac 13<sup>2f.</sup>). There Barnabas and Saul were duly ordained by "certain prophets and teachers" to their great pioneering work, and in the name of Christ they went forth to evangelize the nations. Then, as now, the field was the world, although in those days the known world was practically limited to the shores of the Mediterranean. Within that sphere their labours were of the most herculean type. Paul soon distinguished himself as the principal agent in winning

the Gentiles for Christ. God had effectually revealed His Son in him that he might preach Him among the heathen (Gal 1<sup>16</sup>), and this became with him a consuming passion. "Woe is me," he said, "if I preach not the gospel" (1 Co 9<sup>16</sup>). In the full conviction that his mission was inspired by the direct counsel of God (Eph 3<sup>34</sup>), and entrusted to him as an ambassador (2 Co 5<sup>19f.</sup>); fortified, moreover, by the knowledge that the gospel was for all alike ("for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Ro 10<sup>13</sup>), he consecrated his marvellous powers to its propagation, till finally he declared his readiness to sacrifice his life in its behalf (2 Tim 4<sup>6f.</sup>).

(f) *His Conscious Union with Christ.*—The phrase "in Christ" is of constant occurrence in the Epistles. Christ is woven into the very texture of the apostle's being. He dies in Christ's death, and is raised to newness of life in His resurrection (Ro 6<sup>5</sup>). He has become a new creation, in personal mystic union with the Saviour. Joined to the Lord, he is one with Him in spirit (1 Co 6<sup>17</sup>). Through the infusion into himself of Christ's personality, his former self has practically disappeared. Between him and the Master there is a real solidarity of life, so that they are indissolubly welded into a unity. While Paul's conversion meant an intellectual change from his old attitude to Christ, it was also much more. It was an intense personal application of Christ as Master, Redeemer, and Lord, an apprehension so persistent and absorbing, such a dominant element thenceforth in the life of the apostle, that by degrees it came to mean little less than an actual identification of will. This relation to Christ amounted to real absorption, a union in death and life. "With Christ," he says, "I have been crucified" (Gal 2<sup>20</sup>). To begin with, his union with Christ was a fellowship in crucifixion. It took its rise in an intense spiritual conflict following upon his remarkable vision on the Damascus road. The descrip-

tion of this as a crucifixion points to the depth of remorse induced by that vision during three agonizing days (Ac 9<sup>9</sup>). In the sequel: "and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me," the life is viewed as the result of the death. His union with Christ in death led to his union with Him in spiritual life (2 Co 4<sup>10f.</sup>), even as Christ's resurrection followed upon His crucifixion. This new spiritual life experienced by him though still living in the flesh—and that not as a hermit dwelling in isolation, but as one living a normal life on earth in contact with the world around him—he owed to his "faith in the Son of God, who," he adds in words that will bear repetition, "loved me, and gave himself for me." When he thus refers to the love and sacrifice of Christ as if he himself had been their sole object, this is exactly parallel to his previous expression of close personal union effected by the new life of Christ within him.

(g) *His Yearning for ever fuller Spiritual Enlightenment.*—This finds striking expression in Ph 3<sup>8f.</sup>: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." It was no mere intellectual knowledge that he sought. In its fullest range the knowledge of Christ implies knowledge gained through fellowship. Distinctly of this character was that pointed to in Paul's highest aspiration as given in the context: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings." He could never get to know Him enough. In this we have a genuine trait of Christian experience. The more we know of some things, and of some people, the less we admire them, but the reverse is the case with regard to Jesus Christ. The knowledge of Him satisfies the understanding, pacifies the conscience, and purifies the heart. It was keenly realized by the apostle that the farther we travel in the direction of personal communion with the Saviour, the more shall we be transformed into His like-



ness. While living in this world the Christian's knowledge will be only in part, but he can always be adding to it, and can live in anticipation of the day when he shall know even as also he is known (1 Cor 13<sup>9ff.</sup>).

(h) *His Absolute Personal Devotion to the Service of his Lord.*—In common with other phases of his Christian experience, this dates from the moment of his first apprehension of the Saviour. He could truly say: "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision" (Ac 26<sup>19</sup>). He followed the gleam. The sight of the living Lord at once compelled his unqualified obedience. The revelation he had received of God's Son in him shewed him his vocation. Immediately he realized his mission to preach Christ among the Gentiles, and that without consultation held with any human being (Gal 1<sup>16</sup>). Thomas Carlyle's declaration: "Blessed is the man who has found his work," is peculiarly true of Paul. His every thought was brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ (2 Co 10<sup>5</sup>). Everything else was burned up in the flame of his devotion. His spiritual intuition was released from its former limits by the radiation of the glory of the Lord—an experience which through conversion every Christian may share (2 Co 3<sup>18</sup>). Henceforth for Paul, life was summed up in one word: "To me to live is Christ" (Ph 1<sup>21</sup>). No other interest could compete with this; it engrossed his mind, it inspired his work. His attitude is fitly expressed in the motto: "Ever, only, all for Thee." Constrained by the dynamic of sacrificial love (2 Co 5<sup>14</sup>), he lived with the one object of holding fellowship with Christ, and of spending and being spent in His service through the service of his brethren (2 Co 12<sup>15</sup>). With eager enthusiasm he writes: "This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Ph 3<sup>13f.</sup>). Meanwhile this had come to be the essential element, the

central and controlling power of his whole existence, and would remain such till the dissolution of his bodily frame. For him to die would really be "gain" (Ph 1<sup>21</sup>), inasmuch as it would mean still closer and abiding union with Christ.

(i) *Walking by Faith and not by Sight* (2 Co 5<sup>7</sup>).—Paul and his fellow-workers were no materialists. In their estimation the visible and transitory was of small significance in comparison with the unseen and eternal. For them the eye of faith revealed regions higher and more blessed and more enduring than anything open to bodily vision. Accounting the spiritual more real than mere material "appearances" which are often deceptive, they waited in faith for the actual sight of their glorified Lord until they should be with Him. And just because they were still absent from Him they could not walk by sight. "What the Christian can see at present points always to something away beyond itself. His life of faith culminates in thoughts which point to a future of immeasurable glory."<sup>1</sup>

The practical duties of everyday life also are viewed as a stewardship to be fulfilled in faith. And it is important to realize that according to the apostle the obligation of Christian stewardship extends to the whole of life. Systematic storing for God is a duty strongly enjoined in the Pauline Epistles (1 Co 16<sup>2</sup>). There is, however, no warrant for limiting the idea and practice of stewardship to the matter of money. It has been truly described as "an attitude of the spirit that dominates and consecrates all life." Paul regarded the preaching of the Gospel as a stewardship with which he was entrusted (1 Co 9<sup>17</sup>), and as conceived in his epistles the duty of stewardship embraces the entire scope of the Christian's relations to God and man. "Moreover, it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful" (1 Co 4<sup>2</sup>). The natural corollary of faith is faithful-

<sup>1</sup> Herrmann *op. cit.* p. 219.

ness. Men are not viewed as possessors, but merely as stewards of what has been gifted to them by God, whether in their outer or inner life. This is essentially involved in the life of faith. The gifts in question are the ordinary gifts of the Spirit, bodily and mental, and all entail responsibilities. In every case God has bestowed a gift of grace to be used for His glory and for the benefit of brother men, and those who have faithfully thus employed it will meet with fitting recompense at the last judgement. But how will it then fare with guilt incurred in the Christian state? As the judgement is applicable to all Christians alike (2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>; Ro 14<sup>10</sup>), clearly notwithstanding the forgiveness of pre-Christian guilt bestowed in virtue of Christ's atoning death on those who responded to the Gospel call, this does not in the estimation of the apostle annul retribution for offences subsequently committed. At the same time there is no reason to think that he means to represent that transgressors who have penitently abandoned sin and embraced the life of faith will be excluded from the Messianic kingdom, or to question the continuing efficacy of the gift of grace.

(j) *His Assurance of a Blessed Immortality.*—In the same spirit of faith that animated the Psalmist (Ps 116<sup>10</sup>), and with a similar reliance upon the divine promise, he says: "I too believe and so speak, sure that He who raised the Lord Jesus will raise me too with Jesus and set me at your side in his presence" (2 Co 4<sup>10f.</sup>). It was faith that underlay his testimony and opened his lips. The "hope of glory" was inspired by the indwelling of Christ in the heart (Col 1<sup>27</sup>) through faith (Eph 3<sup>17</sup>). It was faith, too, that rendered effective in the activities of His servants the life-giving power of the risen and exalted Christ, and gave assurance that those united in fellowship and service with Him would be raised up to share in His glory (Ro 8<sup>17</sup>). Throughout his epistles it is his unfaltering testimony that the living

Christ saves men by the communication of His risen life. And so in Jesus we see the revelation of God not only as Lord of history, but also as Lord of glory and Giver of eternal life. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Co 5<sup>17</sup>), destined, as another apostle expresses it, to enjoy an eternal inheritance reserved for him in heaven (1 Pet 1<sup>4</sup>), and thus to be "for ever with the Lord" (1 Thess 4<sup>17</sup>). Paul's mind literally grows with the consciousness of this spiritual renewal and glorious destiny. Many as are the perils in the path of the Christian, he is thus in a position to overcome them all. Of this the great apostle is magnificently conscious. Triumphantly he asks in one of the sublimest passages from his pen: "What can ever part us from Christ's love? Can anguish, or calamity, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or the sword?" And to his own question he gives the emphatic reply: "Nay; in all this we are more than conquerors through him who loved us" (Ro 8<sup>35ff.</sup>). Death itself cannot snatch a victory from those entrenched behind the rampart of God's love in Christ. In this clear and confident note struck by the apostle Paul, Christians of every age and clime have rejoiced to find aid to their own assurance of attaining the resurrection from the dead (Ph 3<sup>11</sup>). And be it remembered, that apart from the resurrection of Christ there is no adequate explanation of the existence of the Christian Church in the world to-day. That Jesus lived, and lives, is the central fact of history attested by many witnesses, and on this foundation is built the hope of life everlasting cherished by His followers.

Of late there has been much discussion concerning the resurrection and the conditions of life in the world to come. The old question, "How are the dead raised, and with what kind of body do they come?" has been revived, and we are assured that many devout people no longer believe in a bodily resurrection. This,

however, leaves the question as to the spiritual body spoken of by Paul without any definite answer. "There is," he says, "a natural (or animate) body, and there is a spiritual body" . . . and "God giveth it (the latter) a body as it hath pleased Him" (1 Co 15<sup>35, 38, 44</sup>). It is doubtful whether with regard to the nature of this spiritual body any pronouncement more specific than this can be warrantably made. According to a recently revived theory the dead live on in the etheric body, the body in which Jesus entered through the closed door, and disappeared as suddenly as He came (Jn 20<sup>19ff.</sup>). However this may be, the supremely important fact remains that He appeared to the disciples as the risen Lord, and as such is alive for evermore. The theory of the ethereal body, though not new,<sup>1</sup> offers at least a more intelligible solution than is afforded by the still unproved claims of spiritists. While no reasonable objection can be taken to the plea of scientists like Sir Oliver Lodge, or writers like Sir A. Conan Doyle, that all they advocate is further study of the elusive problem of communications with the dead, it must be acknowledged that hitherto the grave has kept its secret well. And it is hardly a breach of charity to say that many who, apparently out of a morbid curiosity, seek to pick the lock of the next world, are endeavouring to be wise "above what is written." That this judgement has been resented does not mean that it is untrue.

## (2) THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

The counsels contained in the First Epistle of Peter, which is addressed to the exiles of the Dispersion, are in general agreement with the teaching of the Pauline letters, although it gives less prominence to the mystical union with Christ. On the other hand, a special point of contact between this and the epistles of Paul is that like them it is based upon the fact of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> See Note 9, p. 391.

vicarious sufferings (1<sup>18f.</sup>, 2<sup>21</sup>, 3<sup>18</sup>) and upon the writer's own personal experience. In Peter's case this meant first-hand acquaintance as an eye-witness with his Master's humiliation until at Calvary He "gave up the ghost." Through his own experience he could set his seal to the assurance given in Mt 5<sup>12</sup>. "I was," he says, "a witness of what Christ suffered, and I am to share the glory that will be revealed" (5<sup>1</sup>). Particular stress is laid by him on the intimate connexion between the suffering of Messiah and His after-glory (1<sup>11</sup>). Analogous to this is the statement that amid all his trials the Christian has been "begotten again unto a hope of life by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1<sup>3</sup>). The trial of our faith is destined to end in glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ (1<sup>7</sup>), and so far from being counted "a strange thing," should in virtue of its purifying effect be a subject for joy (4<sup>12f.</sup>). According to this apostle of hope, it is, however, imperative that we suffer as Christians (4<sup>16</sup>), since heaven can be reached only by the way of the cross. In taking up the cross as His followers we become "partakers of Christ's sufferings" (4<sup>13</sup>), and also of the hope of an eternal inheritance through His resurrection from the dead (1<sup>3f.</sup>). The basis of a life of obedience in fellowship with God is laid in "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus" (1<sup>2</sup>). With the clearest conviction arising from his own independent experience the apostle declares that not otherwise than through Christ's death as the sinless and sacrificial Lamb (1<sup>19</sup>) can the Christian attain to the life of holiness which God requires (1<sup>15f.</sup>). It is noteworthy that while thus stressing the exemplary character of the sufferings of Christ as a model for Christians under trial, the writer passes at once to the larger conception of His sufferings as the only source of redemption for mankind as a whole, not even excluding those who had apparently perished beyond hope (3<sup>18ff.</sup>). His

testimony is that the sinless One "bare our (*i.e.* humanity's) sins in his own body on the tree" (2<sup>24</sup>), and that "He also hath once suffered for sins" (3<sup>18</sup>). This is not put forth as an argument, but rather proclaimed as a message. Stedfastness in the faith (5<sup>9</sup>) is the bounden duty of "all that are in Christ Jesus" (5<sup>14</sup>; cf. 3<sup>16</sup>), and would press on by the way of the cross to the unfading crown (5<sup>4</sup>).

Equally imperative for such is a corresponding loyalty. It is required, for instance, of all Christians whatsoever that they be "good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (4<sup>10</sup>). The Petrine language here is based upon the Parable of the Steward who "wasted his lord's goods" (Lk 16<sup>1-12</sup>), and the reference to "the manifold (or *varied*) grace of God" epitomizes what is urged in fuller detail by Paul in Ro 12<sup>6-8</sup> and 1 Co 12<sup>8-10</sup>.

No reader can fail to realize how warmly the apostle writes. It is no mere second-hand version of spiritual truth that is served up to us in this epistle, no mere echo of some one else's thoughts and exhortations. The words are written out of Peter's individual experience. His joyous spirit breaks forth into thanksgiving as he contemplates the greatness and the efficacy of the consolations of God. Earth's sorrows are swallowed up in the joy of the very thought of the heavenly inheritance. After the opening greeting his first word is: "Blessed be God."

### (3) THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN

The Johannine witness to the essential importance for the Christian life of conscious union or fellowship with Jesus is no less emphatic than that of Paul. In the very forefront of his First Epistle the writer stresses the fact that it is the outcome of his own personal experience ("that which we have seen and heard") and that the end he has in view is the cultivation of mutual

fellowship. It is "fellowship with us" (the apostles), but it is more; it is at the same time "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ" (1<sup>3</sup>). Underlying the statement is the conception of the whole circle of Christian discipleship as a spiritual body in communion not only with one another, but also with God the Father through their common association with His Son Jesus Christ—the same conception as is expressed in the affirmation of Paul: "Faithful is the God through whom ye were called to the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Co 1<sup>9</sup>).

Fellowship with Jesus is not, however, incompatible with the consciousness of sin. On the contrary, it induces it, and prompts to the confession of it with a view to its being forgiven. John accordingly testifies to the Christian's acknowledgment of sin: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves. . . . If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (1<sup>8f.</sup>). "It is the fact of sin which led the apostle to think of the saving significance of the death of Jesus."<sup>1</sup> Those who have been purified from sin through the blood of Jesus, God's Son, and so placed in "the light" (the symbol of the divine holiness) know full well that the light does not emanate from themselves. Against the background of the divine holiness "we" (the apostle includes himself), albeit in a measure walking habitually in that light, are nevertheless to some extent still shrouded in the moral and spiritual darkness which shuts men out from God. And John's testimony is that if we confess our sins, that is, not only our sinful state, but definite actual transgressions, full pardon will not be withheld (1<sup>9</sup>). He who is faithful to His promises, and yet righteous in His antagonism to sin, will assuredly forgive. This forms a parallel to Paul's declaration that "God is just himself, and that he justifies man on the score of

<sup>1</sup> Beyschlag, *op. cit.* ii. p. 447.



faith in Jesus " (Ro 3<sup>26</sup>). Not only are we who confess our sins delivered from suffering the due reward of our deeds, but we are also "cleansed from all unrighteousness" and set in the way of holiness. The "cleansing" (1<sup>7</sup>) which we undergo deepens our sense of sin, and prompts us to confess it in order to its removal through the divine forgiveness. When the writer afterwards asserts that it is morally impossible for God's children to sin (3<sup>9</sup>), he is contrasting their behaviour with that of habitual transgressors who are children of the devil. Whosoever has been begotten of God, and the steady trend of whose life is described as an "abiding" in Him, or as "doing righteousness" (2<sup>29</sup>), "sinneth not," that is, as compared with regular evil-doers. There is no suggestion of Perfectionism.

Further, the Christian recognizes and appropriates the remedy for sin: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (2<sup>11</sup>). It would, of course, be utterly to misread the apostle's meaning, as well as to ignore his avowed object in writing, namely, "that ye sin not," to suppose that his very next words represent sin as a venial matter. In no way do they minimize the seriousness of sin; what they do is to assure the penitent that sin in the shape of definite acts is not beyond redress. "If any one *have* sinned," says the apostle, "we have an advocate" (paraclete), a spokesman or intercessor, to plead on our behalf. This advocate is "Jesus Christ the righteous," the sinless Son of God, who before the throne of the Father acts as daysman for us. It is remarkable that He Himself is a propitiation. He offers Himself, and is thus at once high-priest and victim. Truly a unique type of advocate. The Intercessor stands before the throne in the character of an expiatory sacrifice. God's

Son is the propitiation for the sins we are constantly committing in thought, word, and deed.

This expiatory offering, moreover, is available for "the sins of the whole world." The apostle's language, while reminiscent of the Mosaic ritual and of the intercession of the high-priest with the blood of the sacrifices on the Day of Atonement, forms a decided contrast to the exclusiveness which marked the Jewish ritual. "No son of human race" is denied the benefit of this great propitiation. To the unspotted righteousness of the high-priestly victim John can testify from personal knowledge (1 Jn 2<sup>29</sup>), and he can also certify from his own experience that the blood of Jesus is an unfailing specific in cleansing us from all unrighteousness. In the estimation of the apostle the reality of the remedy for sin is not less firmly established than the reality of sin itself.

It is a further part of his testimony that the Christian treads the way of holiness. This he does by "walking in the light" (1 Jn 1<sup>7</sup>, etc.). The expression is used as setting forth the whole content of Christ's revelation of the Father. Just as every saving word and deed is summed up in the statement, "God is love," so does this other statement, "God is light" (1 Jn 1<sup>5</sup>), set forth in true inwardness all that Christ ever said and did. "God is love" defines the character of God; "God is light" further defines it by declaring His love to be a *holy* love. Both love and righteousness are blended in Him. In Him dwells all perfection. He is light, and in order to receive of His fulness we must walk in the light. If we are His, light and not darkness must be our element. Walking in the divinely illuminated path, we are ourselves made light, and grow in holiness. Two contributory factors towards a daily walk of this type are represented in 1 John as essential. These are (a) Love of the brethren (2<sup>7-11</sup>), a duty based on God's love to us: "If God so loved us, we ought

also to love one another " (4<sup>11</sup>). To refrain from such love is tantamount to reproaching God for loving. (b) Confidence in prayer : " If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us " (5<sup>14</sup>). Our requests go unheeded only when they run counter to His will, and in every such case the denial coincides with our best interests.

At the close of his epistle the writer deals with Christian certainties. These are ranked under three categories, each of which is prefaced by the assurance : " We know " (5<sup>18-20</sup>). They are based upon the experience of the apostle in common with that of all united with him in fellowship with God through the Lord Jesus Christ. First in order is the affirmation that the static condition of the Christian is one of antagonism to sin. Although in the immediately preceding context the writer says that if a Christian sins, his brethren will intercede for him, he again asserts, as previously in 3<sup>9</sup>, that " any one who is born of God does not sin." In the one case he has in view what may abnormally happen ; in the other the reference is to the regular condition. And the apostle's declaration regarding the avoidance of sin by the child of God he supplements by saying : " He who was born of God preserves him, and the Evil One never catches him " (5<sup>18</sup>). The conviction that in Christ there is perfect safety is one of the most cherished facts of Christian experience. We are held securely in God's embrace. The second certainty of Christian knowledge concerns the believer's relation to the world : " We know that we belong to God, and that the whole world lieth in the Evil One " (5<sup>19</sup>). There could not be a sharper contrast than is here drawn between the position of those who adhere to Christ and that of those who are under the dominion of the adversary. The latter embraces the whole non-Christian world—a classification which not only plainly points to the clear-cut separation between the church and the world, but

also by way of corollary to the task devolving upon Christians to shoulder the responsibility implied in their profession to win the world for their Master. To the individual and to the Church collectively the call is, "Come away from them, and be ye separate," but we shall not err if we infer that conjoined with this in the apostolic mind is the missionary command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." The third important element in the certitude of Christians is connected with their relation to the Son of God: "We know that the Son of God has come, and has given us insight to recognize him who is the true God, even in his Son Jesus Christ" (5<sup>20</sup>). While thus repudiating the boasted intellectual superiority of the Gnostics of his time, the apostle claims that their intellectual capacity is far exceeded by that of Christians, who are divinely endowed with insight by means of which they arrive at the knowledge of the true God through His Son Jesus Christ. Our faith, however, is no mere matter of theory, but involves this personal knowledge of God; and its entire structure and solid certainties rest on the basal and momentous fact of the Incarnation.

#### (4) THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

The Epistle of James is a circular letter to the Jewish-Christian churches of the Dispersion, and to expatriated Jews in general. Aptly called "the Sermon on the Mount among the epistles," it is ethical rather than theological. The emphasis is laid on practical godliness. Nevertheless it cannot fairly be said that, although teaching mainly the necessity of repentance, reality, and good works, it keeps Christ and the Gospel message in the background. Its opening words co-ordinate Him with God, and in subsequent passages it speaks of trust in His word of promise (1<sup>12</sup>), of His gospel as the word of truth (1<sup>18</sup>), of His exalted position as Lord of

Glory (2<sup>1</sup>), and of His Second Advent as Judge (5<sup>7f.</sup>). In all this the writer reveals the psychology of the truly Christian soul.

To the general absence of doctrinal teaching from the Epistle of James a notable exception presents itself in what he writes regarding the nature and origin of sin. It is viewed as due to the sensuality which leads men to cleave to the world instead of practising unwavering fidelity to God in whose image they have been created (3<sup>9</sup>). Assuming the fact of its existence, the writer traces the development of sin in the individual man. "Let no man say when he is tempted (=tried), I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (1<sup>13ff.</sup>). Springing thus from evil desire, sin comes to open manifestation through the surrender of the will to its allurements. It does not come from God,<sup>1</sup> but is the fruit of a plethora of evil inclinations, including not only the grosser forms of selfish lusts, but also other than directly sensuous sins, such as double-mindedness (1<sup>8</sup>), respect of persons (2<sup>1ff.</sup>), evil speaking (3<sup>2ff.</sup>, 4<sup>11</sup>), pride (4<sup>6</sup>), jealousy and faction (3<sup>16</sup>). Neglect of opportunities for doing good is also reckoned as sin (4<sup>17</sup>).

Another doctrinal pronouncement in this epistle is that concerning the new birth through the word of truth: "He (God) of his own will begat us through the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures" (1<sup>18</sup>). Closely akin to Jn 1<sup>13</sup>, it stresses the new birth as the basis of all Christian experience. This second birth amounts to an entire spiritual renewal, and

<sup>1</sup> This is in line with Sir 98<sup>4</sup>: "Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man of himself has created it." Elsewhere, however (100<sup>4</sup>), the author says it was the fallen angels who "brought down sin."

is due to the free goodness of God operating through the word of truth, by which is evidently meant the gospel revealed for man's salvation. Here we are brought to the very summit of the divine goodness, and the writer expressly points out to his fellow-Christians of Jewish blood that the boon had been given them first in preference to others. In them, as the first-fruits, humanity has been "initiated into the kingdom of God." <sup>1</sup>

Characteristic of this epistle is the prominence given to Wisdom. In this the influence of the Wisdom literature, both of canonical books (Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) and also of the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus, is clearly traceable. "It was well that the Apostolic Age should present one type (of saintliness) such as this, in which holiness appeared mainly as identical with Wisdom, that this should be as much the special characteristic of St. James, as Faith was of St. Paul, and Hope of St. Peter, and Love of the beloved disciple." <sup>2</sup>

It is also worthy of mention how markedly the epistle strikes the note of Christian joy in trial (1<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>11</sup>). In the Greek this is already implied in the "greeting" at the outset, the literal meaning of the word being to rejoice. The very salutation of this "servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" is in itself the expression of a wish that those to whom he writes may share in the joy with which he himself was evidently filled. That his tried and suffering brethren should experience a gladness which was his own is thus engraved on the portal of his epistle. He and they alike owed their spiritual birth to the will of God (1<sup>18</sup>), and it was fitting that they should be co-partners in the joy of harvest as "a kind of first-fruits of His creatures" (1<sup>18</sup>).

The most striking feature of this epistle is the statement that faith apart from works is dead (2<sup>17</sup>). An impression that faith alone is necessary in order to

<sup>1</sup> Beyschlag, *op. cit.* i. p. 350.

<sup>2</sup> Plumptre on St. James, in *Cambridge Bible*, Introd., p. 34.

salvation seems to have been general when the epistle was written, and perhaps its principal object was to correct this misapprehension. There is, of course, no real contradiction between the teaching of James and that of Paul. Both their use of words and their purpose in writing were different. With James "works" signify the holy living of the true Christian, and his response to the gift of grace; whereas with Paul the term signifies that legal righteousness by which some were fain to accomplish their own salvation apart from the righteousness of Christ. For James works follow and prove faith; for Paul they are the vain efforts of men who have no faith and despise it as a ground of justification. With James the man who has already believed is "justified," *i.e.* proved to be a righteous man, when his profession is followed up by the practice of holiness; whereas in Paul's view the ungodly are "justified," *i.e.* accepted and declared righteous through the free grace of God on their becoming believers. Again, while Paul's object is to exhibit and rebuke the deadness of mere morality, James's object is to exhibit and rebuke the deadness of mere orthodoxy apart from a pious life. Each of the two writers would have said amen to the pronouncements of the other. Paul says faith justifies, that is, faith only is that which justifies, not works; but James says, yes, but not a faith which is without works. The combined force of the two statements is that faith alone justifies, but not the faith which is alone. There is no warrant for silencing the one at the expense of the other.

#### (5) THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

The Epistle of Jude is on the one hand a strong impeachment of "ungodly men"—visionary traducers of the gospel, and libertines who "turned the grace of God into lasciviousness," and disowned the Lord Jesus Christ (vv. 4, 8). On the other, it is an urgent appeal

to Christian readers to contend for the faith once for all committed to the saints (v. 3). The writer points to the doom alike of corporate and individual wickedness in the past (vv. 5-11) as a forecast of that awaiting the evil-doers who were now desolating the church. Broadly, the epistle is a manifesto against antinomian free-thinkers, and a plea for adherence to primitive apostolic tradition. Counselling repudiation of the sensual mockers, the writer persuasively adds: "But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life" (vv. 20 f.). In this beautiful ideal we may clearly read the record of his own Christian life. His intimate acquaintance with apocalyptic literature as shewn in the allusions to the Assumption of Moses (v. 9) and to the Book of Enoch, which has been reckoned the background of the epistle,<sup>1</sup> forms a unique and interesting feature of his work.

#### (6) THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

2 Peter, which stands in close relation to Jude, begins by counselling Christians to seek a fuller "knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord," that is, of the Christian salvation, which is a fulfilment of prophecy, and embraces a corresponding life of holiness as well as the glory to be revealed at the coming of the Lord (ch. 1). The writer then utters a warning against false teachers modelled upon the picture of these drawn by Jude (ch. 2). In ch. 3 he replies to the scoffers who contemptuously denied the Second Advent, and twitted believers with its delay. They are reminded that God had destroyed the world once before; that with Him a thousand years are as one day; and that the day of the Lord will come suddenly. It is also pointed out that the licence of the heretics was founded on an entire

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Lods, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 98 ff.



perversion of Paul's doctrine of grace which had been expressly repudiated by himself (Ro 6<sup>15</sup>).

#### (7) THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

There is no certainty either as to the authorship of this epistle or as to the community to which it was addressed. Two things, however, admit of no dubiety. One is that its atmosphere is distinctly Alexandrian rather than Palestinian, and over this we need not linger further than to take note of its classic style, its adoption of the Platonic contrast between the world of shadows and that of reality, and the uniquely finished character of the composition, which proceeds from first to last with the one definite object of pointing out the vitality and permanence of the religion of Jesus Christ. The other, which concerns us more, is the religious condition of those for whom it was penned. They shewed a decided tendency to drift away from Christ (2<sup>1</sup>). In this they were obviously influenced not only by the stress of persecution and defective understanding of the significance of the Christian atonement, but also by the fact that Christianity seemed to involve disloyalty to the revelation in Judaism, which had been divinely given, mediated through angels, instituted by Moses, and continued by the Aaronic priesthood. The bare simplicity of Christian worship, too, they were disposed to compare unfavourably with the splendid ritual of the Temple, and they apparently chafed under the delay of Christ's coming. In these circumstances the writer strongly appeals to them not to "draw back" or apostatize from the Christian faith, but to "hold fast their profession without wavering" (10<sup>23</sup>). He warns them that the necessary condition of being "partakers of Christ" is that "we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end" (3<sup>14</sup>).

In the first part of the epistle (1-10<sup>18</sup>) he shews the superiority of the Christian to the Jewish dispensation.

He begins by proving Christ to be better than the angels (1<sup>4</sup>) and exalts Him as having been "adjudged greater glory than Moses" (3<sup>5</sup>) and as holding out to His people the assurance of a perfect Rest in the future world (4<sup>9</sup>). Further, he claims that as a High-Priest after the order of Melchizedec our Lord excels the Aaronic high-priesthood (5<sup>11</sup>, 7<sup>26ff.</sup>), and that in fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy He is "the Mediator of a better covenant" than the first entered into with the Jewish fathers at Sinai (8<sup>6</sup>). The main emphasis is laid upon the inferiority of the law to the gospel, the one being merely a preparation for the other. The law is but the shadow of the reality which is Christ (10<sup>1</sup>). While the law "made nothing perfect," the gospel is the final revelation of God to men. In his treatment of the relative value of law and gospel the writer does not, like Paul, approach the subject from the standpoint of man's inability of himself to satisfy the moral standard of the law, but from that of the worshipper's incapacity "to enter into the holiest" by reason of defilement, which could be effectually removed only by the blood of Jesus. The legal is thus represented as simply a symbolic and prophetic forecast of the Christian atonement—a point of view closely akin to that of Peter, whose conception of the relation of the two Testaments is that of prophecy and fulfilment. As Beyschlag has said: "This consideration of the law from its religious and ritual side, which Paul only incidentally refers to, gives our epistle in form a much more exclusively Jewish character than the Pauline system, which everywhere goes back to human and universal considerations." <sup>1</sup>

From the standpoint of the writer the death of Christ is viewed as a priestly act, and is to be interpreted from the idea of priesthood as the necessary basis of fellowship between God and man, and of sacrifice as the only mode of dealing with sin. "Without the shedding of blood is

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* ii. p. 290.

no remission " (9<sup>22</sup>), but through the propitiatory death of the spotless One, sin, which had barred the door between earth and heaven, is effectually removed. As our High-Priest He has made reconciliation for the sins of the people (2<sup>17</sup>), thus changing their relation to God and giving them free access to Him, a result which could not be secured under the Levitical system inasmuch as that was only a yearly reminder of sin (10<sup>3</sup>). In its cleansing power the blood of Christ is thus more efficacious than the OT sacrifices, which merely removed external uncleanness: it penetrates to the conscience, takes away its defilement, and enables the worshipper to draw near to and serve a living God (9<sup>14</sup>). The very core of the Atonement lies in Christ's delighting to do God's will even unto death. "Through eternal spirit" this sacrifice was offered by Him as high-priest of men, and through faith we also are sanctified and enabled to do the will of God (10<sup>8ff.</sup>). By his sacrificial death for sin He has set us in the right relation to God, while in the exercise of His subsequent priesthood on high "He ever liveth to make intercession for us" (7<sup>25</sup>). "It is this idea of the Priesthood of the Son that gives its character to our epistle." <sup>1</sup>

In the second part of his letter (10<sup>19</sup>–13<sup>25</sup>) the writer pleads for steadfast loyalty to the faith of Christ, and exhorts the Jewish Christians to emulate the example of the OT saints in the subordination of the seen and temporal to the unseen and eternal, and that of Jesus Himself, whose life exhibited such shining faith and patient endurance (11–12<sup>3</sup>). The counterpart of Christ's sacrifice is seen in His people's faith.

Although the Epistle to the Hebrews is mainly theological and hortatory, and lends itself less to direct expression of personal experience than the Pauline letters, it obviously rests upon a profound and habitual practice of the presence of God and a high estimate of the value

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Davidson, *op. cit.* p. 33.

of Christian fellowship on the part of the writer (10<sup>22, 24</sup>). He has himself exemplified the consideration of "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Christ Jesus," to which he calls his readers (3<sup>1</sup>), and keeps his eye steadily on Him as forerunner within the veil (6<sup>19</sup>). The hope thus set before us burns brightly within his soul. Rejoicing in the full assurance of faith (10<sup>22</sup>), he exalts it as the very principle of the Christian life (10<sup>38</sup>). His attitude is that of one who is "looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of faith" (12<sup>2</sup>). He knows the blessedness of unwavering attachment to this life of faith, and finds in the hope which it inspires "an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast" (6<sup>19</sup>). The whole epistle, which ends with various exhortations and warnings and a request for prayer (12<sup>4-13</sup>) is written from the standpoint of one personally persuaded of the perfection and finality of the new covenant through which the eternal inheritance is assured to believing men (9<sup>15</sup>).

In view of the conclusive evidence before us, it may safely be asserted that there is no other source of Christianity than the Christ who is a historic fact. The writers of the NT Epistles, however, by the emphasis which they lay on the Christ of experience, guard against the materializing of the history. As Denney has pointedly said: "Except through the historical, there is no Christianity at all, but neither is there any Christianity till the historical has been spiritually comprehended."<sup>1</sup> The latter part of this statement finds illustration in the importance attached in the Epistles to the fact and work of the Holy Spirit, to the consideration of which we now pass.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 280.

## CHAPTER III

### THE FACT OF THE SPIRIT

ALONG with the Fact of Christ as constituting the predominant element in the doctrinal background of the NT Epistles must be reckoned the parallel Fact of the Spirit.

#### I. THE OT USAGE

The expression "Spirit of God" meets us at the very beginning of the Bible, and is represented as a cosmic power bringing order out of chaos (Gn 1<sup>2</sup>). In the OT "spirit" (*ruakh*), literally wind or breath or air in motion, as applied to God denotes the breath of His nostrils (Ex 15<sup>8, 10</sup>; Ps 18<sup>15</sup>), or of His mouth (Ps 33<sup>6</sup>), and so His wrath (Is 4<sup>4</sup>; Zec 6<sup>5</sup>; Job 4<sup>9</sup>). Gn 6<sup>3</sup> represents Him as saying: "My spirit is not to be immortal in mortal creatures." It is stated to have been aggrieved by the rebelliousness of the Israelites in the wilderness (Num 11<sup>1</sup>; Is 63<sup>10ff.</sup>). No moral quality attaches to such abnormal physical and ecstatic experiences as prowess in war (Judg 3<sup>12</sup>, 14<sup>6</sup>, etc.), expert skill in artisans of ancient Israel (Ex 35<sup>30ff.</sup>), or wild prophetic extravagances such as Saul displayed (1 Sam 19<sup>23f.</sup>). The great prophets of the eighth century had a much higher conception of the spirit (Hos 9<sup>7</sup>), but until the time of Ezekiel (c. B.C. 600) references in prophetic writings are few. Exilic and post-exilic Israel was then assured that a "new spirit" would be infused into them (Ezek 36<sup>26f.</sup>; cf. Is 32<sup>15</sup>). Nowhere in the OT is it expressly said that God is spirit, but rather that He has the Spirit and sends it forth (Is 40<sup>13</sup>; Ps 104<sup>30</sup>, 139<sup>7</sup>).

It is through the Spirit that God bears witness to Himself, and that a man becomes a prophet (Num 11<sup>25</sup>), and so another man with another heart (1 Sam 10<sup>9f.</sup>). In Is 32<sup>15</sup> the Spirit is conceived as the source of fruitfulness. It is also the medium of revelation; thus Micah can say: "I am full of power by the Spirit of Jahweh" (3<sup>8</sup>). The promise of the outpouring of the Spirit in the Messianic age is further contained in Joel 2<sup>28</sup>, along with the emphatic declaration that this would extend to "all flesh," that is, according to the context to all grades of Jewish society. It would specially rest on the Messiah himself as a spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might, of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord (Is 11<sup>2</sup>), so as fully to equip him for his stupendous mission. In Ps 51<sup>11</sup> it is adumbrated as already in operation, and the title "Holy Spirit" is employed (cf. Is 63<sup>10f.</sup>). Its designation as "holy" implies at once connexion with God and hostility to sin. The new church is distinctly spiritual (Is 44<sup>3</sup>, 59<sup>21</sup>; Ezek 39<sup>29</sup>), and its purified members have the law written on their hearts so that a ready obedience is secured (Jer 3<sup>22f.</sup>; Ezek 36<sup>25ff.</sup>).

To some extent the Spirit of Jahweh seems to have been reckoned as a being distinct from Jahweh Himself. Yet in this there is possibly no more than a poetical metaphor used without any precise definition of the meaning attached to it. Even Philo's language leaves it uncertain whether he conceived his Logos as a personal Being or merely as a figure of speech. In his Gifford Lectures (1933) Dr. Edwyn Bevan pointed out that "the conception of the *ruakh*—a wind-like power proceeding from God—was a way of combining the idea of God's distance from the world with the idea of His operation in the world. To think of *ruakh* as something personal in itself was easier, they might believe, because *ruakh* meant not only wind, but the higher activities of mind and will in man." At the same

time he viewed the question of the separate personality of the Divine activity in the world as still unsettled.

It is an interesting surmise whether in this connexion Judaism was influenced by similar personifications in Zoroastrianism. The seven *ameshaspentas* who stood around the supreme God have been represented by some scholars as real entities distinct from God, but this is very doubtful.

By the early Christian Church the Spirit's ecstatic manifestations were hailed as the fulfilment of prophetic forecasts (Ac 2<sup>14. 16ff.</sup>), and its visible descent upon Jesus at His baptism viewed as His endowment with power for His Messianic work. Hitherto, however, the Spirit had never been clearly conceived as a distinct personality.

## 2. THE SPIRIT IN THE NT EPISTLES

While OT ideas are naturally present to the minds of the NT writers, they regard the Spirit of God mainly from the side of practical experience. For them it meant the realization of the "new spirit" of Ezek 36<sup>26</sup>, that is, "God exerting power."<sup>1</sup> Even in the OT there is traceable a certain advance from the conception of the Spirit as a divine influence towards that of personality. As the idea of the divine "holiness" gradually assumed a more ethical content, the way was paved for the NT doctrine. The use of the term "vexed," that is, resisting the guidance of the Holy Spirit, "marks the highest degree of personification of the Spirit in the OT preparing the way for the NT doctrine concerning Him."<sup>2</sup> It has been thought by some that in the Apocrypha the Holy Spirit is viewed as a kind of secondary God.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Davidson, *Ezekiel* (in Cambridge Bible), p. 264.

<sup>2</sup> J. Skinner, *Isaiah* (in Cambridge Bible), ii. p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> Wisd 9<sup>17</sup>. Here, however, "Holy Spirit" is probably used merely as the equivalent of Wisdom as in 7<sup>22</sup>, and without reference to the third Person of the Trinity.

The Holy Spirit is as closely related to God as the spirit of a man to a man (1 Co 2<sup>11</sup>), and is yet distinguished from Him as but "the earnest" of our inheritance (2 Co 1<sup>22</sup>; cf. Eph 1<sup>14</sup>). Although from the declaration of the Christian creed in 1 Co 8<sup>6</sup> the Holy Spirit is absent, in the Apostolic Benediction it is given a place alongside of God and Christ (2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>).

### 3. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT

The personality of the Spirit seems clearly indicated in the statement: "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Co 2<sup>10</sup>). When to this it is added that the Spirit acts as our Teacher (1 Co 2<sup>13</sup>) and Intercessor (Ro 8<sup>26f.</sup>) [and is capable of feeling (Eph 4<sup>30</sup>)], the fact of personality, so far as Paul is concerned, is scarcely open to doubt. The same thing applies to the deity of the Spirit, in view of the assertion that "none knoweth the things of God save the Spirit of God" (1 Co 2<sup>11</sup>).

### 4. THE PRONOUN "IT" WITH REFERENCE TO THE SPIRIT

Although the Holy Spirit is thus not to be regarded merely as an impersonal influence to which the pronoun "He" is inapplicable, the use of the neuter pronoun "it" is perhaps for the most part preferable. The reason for this is that it is desirable to avoid conveying the impression that the Spirit is a person distinct from God and Christ in the ordinary sense of the term "person." Seeing that Scripture lends no support to this view, the use of "it" in allusion to the Spirit prevents confusion of thought, and tends to check a too widely diffused misunderstanding concerning the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Rightly regarded, that does not denote three separate persons, but only one God in the three aspects of Father, Son, and Holy



Spirit. "The Spirit of God is not in Paul's view an independent personality; that is not implied in the doctrine of the personality of the Spirit; but as the spirit of a man is to the man, so according to Paul the Spirit of God is to God, in one sense the same, but in another sense distinct."<sup>1</sup>

## 5. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF THE SPIRIT

(1) Fundamental to this apostle's conception of the Spirit is its relation to Christ. In his letters it is spoken of not only as the Spirit of God, but also as the Spirit of Christ (Ro 8<sup>9</sup>). Between the Christian and Christ there is a fellowship of spirit (1 Co 1<sup>9</sup>, 6<sup>17</sup>), conjoined with "the communion of the Holy Ghost" (2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>). So essential is this fellowship that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Ro 8<sup>9</sup>). On the other hand, those who are Christ's are indicated through the Spirit's indwelling in their hearts, and are in the same passage spoken of as being "in the Spirit." To the apostle, then, the Spirit is no mere mechanical influence descending from without, but a gracious Presence dwelling in the heart so as to constitute the Christian a temple of God (1 Co 3<sup>16</sup>). Paul views the Spirit, however, not only as an inspiring presence and holy companion, but also as a transforming power. Conceiving of the risen Lord who had appeared to him as essentially "Spirit," he is conscious that a new power has entered into his life. He claims that his preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (1 Co 2<sup>4</sup>), and that beholding the glory of the Lord reflected from the face of Christ, the believer is "changed into the same image, passing from one glory to another," for "this comes of the Lord the Spirit" (2 Co 3<sup>18</sup>). In the preceding verse he makes actual identification of the Spirit with Christ: "Now the Lord is the Spirit." Definite as this language is, it should not perhaps be taken too literally in view of what im-

<sup>1</sup> J. S. Candlish, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 26.

mediately follows: "and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." "Paul in other words," as Kennedy has said, "leaves a fluctuating margin between his conception of Christ and the Spirit." The same writer points out that where he speaks especially of the transforming power experienced by him as the result of contact with the risen Lord he speaks of the Spirit, and that when he dwells on the source of this new energy he speaks of Christ.<sup>1</sup> As the Spirit of Christ the Holy Spirit brings the divine presence into the human spirit, but this experience is limited to men of faith. The Holy Spirit fills and possesses all who, through fellowship with Christ, exercise a living trust.

(2) For Paul, indeed, the reception of the Spirit is the ruling principle of the distinctively Christian life: "No man can say Jesus is Lord, except by the Holy Spirit" (1 Co 12<sup>3</sup>). It leads to a new idea of God, by shedding abroad His love in men's hearts and constraining them to say, "Abba, Father" (Ro 5<sup>5</sup>, 8<sup>15</sup>). The Spirit which has thus made their hearts its abode is expressly designated "the Spirit of God's Son" (Gal 4<sup>6</sup>).

(3) Accordingly, it is not surprising to find that in Paul's view the Spirit's operations are practically interchangeable with those of the indwelling Christ, the believer's privileges and attainments being ascribed sometimes to the one, and sometimes to the other.<sup>2</sup> At the same time it must be recognized that in general the apostle thinks of Christ and the Spirit as two distinct entities (Gal 5<sup>5a</sup>; Ph 2<sup>1</sup>; 2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>, etc.).

(4) In 1 Co 12-14 certain spiritual gifts of an abnormal type are referred to the operation of the Spirit. These include ecstatic, and, apart from interpretation, unintelligible, speaking with tongues, pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> According to Morgan, *op. cit.* p. 25, this was the logical outcome of Paul's Christ-mysticism.

phesying, and a higher Christian gnosis than that of pagan philosophical speculation. While regarding the Spirit as the source of these peculiar manifestations, Paul ascribes to them only an inferior value. There are greater gifts than these. He knows, for he has had his share of them. Quite decisively he expresses his preference for speech with the understanding and the heart to that with a tongue (1 Co 14<sup>19</sup>). The normal action of the Spirit is not of an eccentric or ecstatic character. It is the source of holiness as well as of supernatural gifts. Not only has "the law of the Spirit leading to life freed us in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death" (Ro 8<sup>2</sup>), but through its ruling power in the heart it also produces a rich harvest in the redeemed Christian's habits of life. Its fruits, as seen in the graces of Christian character and the virtues of the Christian life—namely, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" (Gal 5<sup>22f.</sup>)—bear an essentially ethical stamp. Though not so showy as the extraordinary gifts which excited the wonder of the early Church, these are the gifts to be most earnestly desired. "Thus faith and hope and love last on, these three, but the greatest of all is love" (1 Co 13<sup>13</sup>). In the list given by the apostle of the fruits of the Spirit's working, love occupies the foremost place, and it is for the most part as the supreme manifestation of the Spirit among Christian brethren that he commends the practice of it to his readers. Thus, for example, in writing to the Romans he begs for their prayers "by the love that the Spirit inspires" (Ro 15<sup>30</sup>). He likewise gratefully welcomes the assurance brought by Epaphras from the Christians of Colossæ of their "love in the Spirit" (Col 1<sup>8</sup>). So, too, in urging upon the Philippians the importance of harmony within their circle "fellowship of the Spirit" is one of the conceptions on which his exhortation is based (Ph 2<sup>1</sup>). His insistence upon the

necessity for mutual love among Christian brethren is not in the interests of obedience to any "external code";<sup>1</sup> his object is to induce them to realize that in the power of the Spirit they could overcome all antipathies and heart-burnings, and live in harmonious unity and brotherly love (Ph 2<sup>1-3</sup>; Col 3<sup>14f.</sup>).

#### 6. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

In 1 Peter there is not much that is distinctive of the Spirit. Apart from the emphasis placed on "the sanctification (or consecration) of the Spirit," resulting in the Christian life of faith and obedience (1<sup>2</sup>), and the parallel reference in 1<sup>22</sup>, which speaks of the purification of the believing soul through the Spirit, the only further allusion is that in 1<sup>11</sup> regarding the Messianic Spirit within the OT prophets. By this divine agency they were enabled to forecast the sufferings of the Messiah and His after-glory as ultimately disclosed in the preaching of the gospel "through the Holy Spirit sent from heaven" (1<sup>12</sup>). To the Spirit's working are equally to be ascribed the dimmer prophetic anticipation and the clearer announcement of the Christian preachers. Both were God's messengers, and for fuller light on what is yet to follow as the fruit of Christ's redemptive work the angels themselves are said to look forward with longing. The declaration that Christ, after being put to death in the flesh, came into life in His spirit (3<sup>18</sup>), can hardly be understood as applicable to the Holy Spirit. What we have here is rather a simple antithesis between the "flesh" and the "spirit" of the man Christ Jesus (cf. Ro 1<sup>3f.</sup>).

#### 7. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN

In 1 Jn 2<sup>20</sup> it is said of Christians: "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One," by whom is probably meant Christ, who confers the Spirit. Like Christ

<sup>1</sup> See Moffatt, *Love in the NT*, p. 169.

Himself primarily, Christians are in a secondary sense the Lord's anointed. Oil is emblematic of the invisible unction of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, who lived in the fourth century, says of Christians: "Ye are properly called christs," that is, through the reception of the emblem of the Holy Spirit. A second and more direct reference to the Spirit in this epistle occurs in 3<sup>24</sup>: "Herein we come to know that He (God) abideth in us, from the Spirit which He gave us." The knowledge in question is communicated through the Spirit, and the assurance here conveyed is thus definitely based on Christian experience. Further, it is claimed that the confession of Jesus Christ as come in the flesh forms a decisive test of the knowledge of the Spirit of God: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ as come in the flesh is of God" (4<sup>2</sup>). This is a twofold claim. On the one hand the Spirit is represented as confirming the historical testimony to the incarnate Christ (as more fully set forth in 5<sup>6</sup>), bearing witness to the water and the blood—in other words, to His baptism and His death—as the outstanding facts in His earthly life as Messiah. On the other hand, it is claimed that the confession of Jesus Christ as come in the flesh shews that the confessor is in conscious touch with the Spirit of God, and knows from inward experience that through Christ the divine gift of the Holy Spirit conveys to him a new and eternal life (cf. 5<sup>10</sup>). The statement in 4<sup>13</sup>: "Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit," is noteworthy on account of its implication that we receive only a share of the gift which, as pointed out in John 3<sup>34</sup>, is bestowed "without measure" upon Christ alone. Finally, there is the declaration: "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth" (5<sup>6</sup>). Here

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Shakespeare's allusion to "holy oil" in *Henry the Eighth*, Act iv. Sc. i.

again stress is laid upon the great fact to which this testimony is directed, namely, the coming of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God. In the threefold attestation of this truth specified in the epistle—"the Spirit, and the water, and the blood"—the writer has in view the false teaching of Cerinthus, who made a distinction between the man Jesus and the heavenly Christ. According to this Gnostic leader the divine Christ descended upon the human Jesus at his baptism, and left him at his passion, to be reunited to him on the ultimate establishment of the Messianic kingdom. This was to deny that Christ came not only through water, but also through blood. Redemption was thus thrust out, and only spiritual enlightenment was required. By the time when 1 John was written this heresy had developed into a widespread "docetic" tendency to turn Christianity into a species of Jesus-mysticism. The idea of Christian love was in danger of being wrested from its historical setting, Jesus being so spiritualized as to obscure His human personality. "This was the risk felt in the movement which is reflected by the First Epistle of John."<sup>1</sup> In opposition to the Cerinthian doctrine, the Johannine author emphatically asserts that belief in the historical as one with the eternal Son of God is the sole specific for overcoming the world (5<sup>4f.</sup>), and the one passport to eternal life (5<sup>11, 13, 20</sup>). To this sublime truth, which forms the very core of the Christian religion, witness is borne from the highest possible quarter, namely, the Holy Spirit, who is truth, and therefore neither liable to nor capable of deception. "And the testimony is that God gave us life eternal, and this life is in His Son" (5<sup>11</sup>). The historic Jesus cannot be severed from the Christ of God, and the Christian experience which rests on this conception of Christ's person is at once sufficient and final. This alone is the true *gnosis*.

<sup>1</sup> Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 63.

## 8. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

After stating that the Lord's message of salvation was confirmed by those who directly heard Him, the author goes on to say that God added His testimony to theirs, not only in the impressive form of "signs and wonders," but also by endowing them with sundry miraculous powers and apportioning to them the Holy Spirit according to His will (2<sup>3f.</sup>; cf. Ro 12<sup>2</sup>; 1 Co 12<sup>4-7</sup>). These remarkable spiritual gifts accompanying the apostolic preaching attested the divine presence and approval. In three passages of this epistle the OT is referred to as the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Ch. 3<sup>7</sup> prefaces a quotation from Ps 95<sup>7-11</sup> with the words, "As the Holy Ghost saith." Again, in ch. 9<sup>8</sup> we find the similar expression, "The Holy Ghost thus signifying," and in ch. 10<sup>15</sup> a citation from Jer 31<sup>31</sup> is characterized as the testimony of the Holy Spirit. The particular connexion in which these quotations occur hardly concerns us here. What falls to be specially noted is that in each case the Scriptural words are attributed not to the human agent, but directly to their divine source. The phrase "partakers of the Holy Ghost" (6<sup>4</sup>) probably points not to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, as A. B. Davidson and others think,<sup>1</sup> but to the distinctive source of the Christian life, and the imparting of the Spirit in response to faith. Participation in the Spirit goes along with "the heavenly gift." In ch. 9<sup>14</sup> it is said that Christ "through eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God." The phrase is introduced to indicate that Christ's blood avails to cleanse the conscience, and any reference to the Holy Spirit seems questionable. "The spiritual

<sup>1</sup> "The Holy Ghost seems spoken of in the Epistle as the source of extraordinary gifts; He is not regarded as the principle of the Christian life in itself as in the Pauline Epistles."—*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 120.

nature of the sacrifice gave it eternal validity. . . . Spirit is eternal, and can alone be efficacious in eternal things.”<sup>1</sup> According to Davidson, however, the phrase seems to point to spirit as the essential being of the Son, and its character as “eternal” to explain how the Son could die, and yet act as a living High-Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. The Holy Spirit is further spoken of as “the Spirit of grace (10<sup>29</sup>). Here “Spirit” stands in contrast to the Mosaic law of the preceding verse, and certainly the reference appears to be to the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit as in 2<sup>4</sup>. To spurn the Spirit who distributes these gifts and conveys the glad assurance of forgiveness, is necessarily to forfeit all part or lot in the spiritual domain.

In the foregoing paragraphs no attempt is made to formulate a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. That is outwith the scope of this book. Our aim has been simply to gather up and present in brief form the main textual references in the NT Epistles to this too much neglected theme, keeping specially in view the point that these pre-eminently reflect the personal experience of the writers. An OT prophet had already laid down the principle: “Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts” (Zec 4<sup>6</sup>), and in the references to the Spirit in the NT Epistles there is definite acknowledgment of its acceptance as the inspiring impulse of life and action. The apostles knew what it was to be “in the Spirit,” and this experience of theirs has been shared by the whole body of the faithful. What Christian preacher, for example, has not felt that *something not himself* is behind his message? And what is this but the same divine power which, through the channel of the Holy Spirit, moved men as they listened to Paul of Tarsus proclaiming his gospel, and convinced them of its truth? The Spirit of Christ

<sup>1</sup> Dods, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*.



is a power and experience of our own as well as of apostolic times.

---

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that apart from the fact of Christ there is no rational explanation of the existence of His Church in the world to-day. In accordance with the testimony borne by its earliest representatives, it is securely based upon the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and taken together these constitute the supreme event in history. So also, apart from the fact of the Spirit, whereby He united His disciples in a holy fellowship and endowed them with power from on high for the mission entrusted to them, how are we to account for the success attending the first proclamation of the gospel and the expansion of the work of the kingdom during the early centuries of the Christian era? These two outstanding facts hang together, and both must be kept in full vision.

Nevertheless, the statement of "certain disciples" at Ephesus: "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost" (Ac 19<sup>2</sup>), practically expresses the standpoint of only too many professing Christians in our time, and were the Apostle Paul living in this modern age, he would have as much cause for surprise at our having forgotten the actuality of the Spirit—a truth so important to the Christian life—as he had when at Corinth he put the question: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Co 3<sup>16</sup>). The name Holy Spirit as associated with baptism, and as occurring in the praise, prayers, and doxologies of the Church, is indeed not unfamiliar, but it may be questioned whether for multitudes it stands for anything more than a barren formula. Their theological dogmatic is limited

to the conceptions of God, and of Christ Jesus the revealer of God. Yet the apprehension of the indwelling Spirit is essential to the Christian soul, and that, too, in no merely mechanical sense, but as a living and operative reality. The frontispiece of an old and still valuable work, Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, depicts the Four Evangelists seated at a table writing their Gospels. Overhead in the centre there is a dove, and down from this stream four columns of light, one resting on the head of each evangelist, to denote the inspiration under which they wrote. To this naïvely mechanical view of the Holy Spirit Paul opposes that of a Presence dwelling in the soul and constituting it a temple of God ["a habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph 2<sup>22</sup>)].

The gift of the Spirit has been truly called "the blessing of the new covenant": it enables the gospel to function. Alike, therefore, in itself and in its working it calls for wider recognition; and the NT Epistles, as exhibiting the application of Christian principles to Christian life, and the practical results flowing from an empowering Spirit, demand close and careful study. The comparative neglect into which they have fallen is not really due to their being "hard to be understood," but rather to widespread failure to live out to the full the Christian life. Wherever there is faithfulness in this respect, springing from a high sense of the obligations resting on "followers" of Jesus, these "scriptures" will be prized and pondered as aids to still higher attainments in Christian practice. Not only, however, are they inspiring incentives to the faithful; they also hold out hope for the fearful. They shew how the misgivings of men's hearts, and their despair of ever being able to rise to what they are too ready to regard as the unattainable in the pursuit of holiness, may be overcome. To read the Epistles aright is to realize that to yield to such spiritual hopelessness is tantamount to disbelief in,

and sin against, the Holy Ghost. If the Apostle Paul could write even to those who had but recently emerged from paganism: "Our gospel came unto you not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit" (1 Thess 1<sup>5</sup>), why should modern adherents of the Christian faith be so slow to believe in the possibility of such an experience being reproduced either in themselves or in others? Surely it is high time for us to get back to the Epistles, and to have done with the faithless prattle about "human nature being what it is," as a cover for timid or cowardly refusal to rise to the height of opportunity offered to us in the gospel of Jesus. After the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, the apostles, as recreated men, could confidently carry their message to all and sundry, in the full persuasion that the grace of God could do for others what it had done for them. Thus Peter assured the Jews that upon their repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins they would receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2<sup>38</sup>), and Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (15<sup>18f.</sup>) refers to the power of the Spirit as manifested beyond his own spheres of labour to make the Gentiles obedient by means of his words and his deeds. The full realization of this truth, so clearly announced and so strikingly illustrated at the very beginnings of Christianity, would effectually dispel the pessimistic mood which retards so many in running the Christian race.

## APPENDIX

NOTE 1. See p. 51

### *Roman Procurators of Judæa*

JUDÆA belonged to the third class of Roman Provinces (according to Strabo's classification), and differed from most provinces in this particular—that the governor was commander-in-chief of the military forces as well as having complete control over the finances and jurisdiction of his territory. Only in very exceptional circumstances could the governor of Syria intervene and take command in Judæa. The troops at the procurator's disposal were not legionaries, but auxiliaries levied from the non-Jewish inhabitants of the country, the Jews being exempted from military service out of respect for their Law. The residence and headquarters of the procurator were at Cæsarea, not Jerusalem, although during the Jewish festivals he took up his residence in the palace of Herod since the great concourse of people in the Holy City seemed to demand personal supervision. In judicial authority the procurator was supreme, save in the case of such Roman citizens as claimed that their trial should take place in Rome.<sup>1</sup> The ordinary administration of the law was left in the hands of the courts of the Jews themselves, and it was seldom that the procurator was called upon in his judicial capacity except in cases of life or death.<sup>2</sup> As the title suggests, perhaps the chief function of the procurator, besides keeping the peace, was the collection of taxes and the administration of finance. The imperial treasury *fiscus* derived its revenue in Judæa from two main sources, (1) *Taxes*, which were of two kinds, namely, Property-tax, levied on

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ac 25<sup>10ff.</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This was exemplified in the case of Jesus (Jn 18<sup>31</sup>).

landed estates, and on what would now be denominated "real-estate"; and Poll-tax, which embraced two subdivisions (a) Personal, or income tax, (b) Equal tax per head of population. These taxes were collected by Roman officials and, as Judæa was an imperial province, as opposed to senatorial, were paid into the *fiscus*, not the *ærarium*. To judge from the complaints made from time to time, the taxes must have been fairly burdensome, but were probably not so onerous as under Herod and Archelaus. (2) *Customs*, i.e. duties on articles exported or imported. The right to collect customs was usually "farmed," or leased to the highest bidder. The lessee, or *publicanus*, contracted to pay to the procurator a certain annual sum, and he gained or lost according as his receipts exceeded or fell below the amount he had paid for his "lease." By this means (one widely adopted in the ancient world) Rome was saved the expense of many petty officials, but the system was naturally conducive to rapacity and oppression among the collectors of customs. That they were highly unpopular is evidenced by the grouping in the NT—"publicans and sinners."

Under the Roman procurators Judæa enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy. The aristocratic Sanhedrin really governed the country, and the high-priest as its president was *προσάρτης τοῦ ἔθνους*, according to Josephus. That the high-priest was appointed, and could be removed, by the Roman procurator at will did not materially affect the state of affairs, as the Romans exercised considerable restraint in this matter. The Jewish religion was protected in every way, in accordance with the Roman principle of universal toleration, and even distinguished Romans offered sacrifices in the Temple. In all other provinces the worship of the Emperor was insisted upon as a proof of loyalty and fidelity, but, except under Caligula, this was never demanded of the Jews. The sanctity of the inner court of the Temple was scrupulously observed, and any violation was punished with death, without appeal even in the case of a Roman citizen. Further respect for Jewish law and customs is shewn by the fact that Roman troops were forbidden to carry into Jerusalem any standards bearing the likeness of the Emperor. Pilate attempted to override Jewish susceptibilities in this

particular through bringing into the city by night standards bearing the imperial effigy. The Jews for once shewed great prudence, and, curbing their indignation, sent a deputation to Pilate at Cæsarea, "praying for remedy." Their persistence carried the day. For five days and nights they implored him to remove the offensive images, and when on the sixth day, determined to be rid of their importunities, he sent his soldiers among them with orders to slay them if they did not immediately disperse, he was so struck with their steadfastness that he caused the images to be removed to Cæsarea.

During the period A.D. 6-41 there were seven procurators : (1) Coponius, 6-9 ; Marcus Ambivius, 9-12 ; Annius Rufus, 12-15 ; Valerius Gratus, 15-26 ; Pontius Pilatus, 26-36 ; Marcellus, 36-37 ; and Marullus, 37-41. Of these the three first were appointed by Augustus, the fourth and fifth by Tiberius, the sixth by Vitellius (acting for Tiberius), and the last by Caligula. The long governorships of Gratus and Pilate shew Tiberius's consideration for the provinces, in that, as Schürer says, "he thought that governors acted like flies on the body of a wounded animal ; if once they were gorged, they would become more moderate in their exactions, whereas new men began their rapacious proceedings afresh " (*HJP*, i. ii. p. 82, Eng. tr.).

NOTE 2. See p. 57

*Agrippa II.*, A.D. 50-100

THE younger Agrippa, for long resident in Rome, had repeatedly proved serviceable to Jewish interests, and about A.D. 50 was served heir to the kingdom of his uncle, Herod of Chalcis. Along with this he received the supervision of the Temple at Jerusalem. Three years later he obtained a new and larger domain, namely, the tetrarchy of Philip, to which Nero afterwards added certain districts of Galilee and Peraea. His relations with his widowed sister Berenice exposed him to much unfavourable criticism in the Roman capital. While entirely submissive to Rome, Agrippa also

made a point of ingratiating himself with the Jews by his orthodox attitude towards their law and ritual. At heart, however, he was quite indifferent to their faith, and indeed to all matters of vital religion (Ac 26<sup>28</sup>). On the outbreak of rebellion in A.D. 66 he did what he could to still the storm. Failing in this, he steadily supported the Roman cause, and did nothing to save Jerusalem from destruction. Although he had previously appointed and dismissed not a few high priests, he no longer exercised any supervision over the Temple ; he simply let things drift. In A.D. 67 he lavishly entertained Vespasian at Cæsarea Philippi, and in the following year accompanied Titus to Rome in order to felicitate Galba on his accession to the throne. That emperor, however, had been murdered before their arrival, and on the appointment of Vespasian as his successor, Agrippa not only gave him his allegiance, but took part with Titus his son in celebrating at Cæsarea Philippi the ruin of his countrymen. His loyalty to Rome was rewarded by further extensions of his territory towards the north. On his revisiting the imperial city with Berenice, public opinion compelled him reluctantly to cast her adrift. Agrippa appears to have died in A.D. 100, his kingdom being merged in the Roman province of Syria.

NOTE 3. See p. 167

*Schweitzer on Apocalyptic Thought in Relation to  
Jewish Eschatology*

“ Historically regarded, the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul are simply the culminating manifestations of Jewish apocalyptic thought. The usual representation is the exact converse of the truth. Writers describe Jewish eschatology in order to illustrate the ideas of Jesus. But what is this ‘ Jewish Eschatology ’ after all ? It is an eschatology with a great gap in it, because the culminating period, with the documents which relate to it, has been left out. The true historian will describe the eschatology of the Baptist, of Jesus, and of Paul in order to explain Jewish eschatology. It is nothing less than a misfortune for the science of NT

Theology that no real attempt has hitherto been made to write the history of Jewish eschatology as it really was ; *i.e.* with the inclusion of the Baptist, of Jesus, and of Paul.”—*The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Eng. tr., p. 366.

NOTE 4. See p. 153

*Christian Churches and the Jewish Problem*

In an interview reported by *The Scots Observer* of June 10, 1933, the Rev. R. F. Chisholm, of Cluj, Transylvania, says :

“ If we have a Jewish problem in Europe and the United States to-day, the organized Christian Church has in some measure created that problem. We complain that the Jew is a separatist. Is it to be wondered at ? In the Middle Ages he was compelled to wear the yellow badge distinguishing him from the Christian. Later, there was the Ghetto system, under which the majority of the Jews in Europe were forced to live during three centuries, 1400-1700—the dreariest period of all Jewish history. In the Ghettos they lived under conditions worse than those in any modern slum. And even to-day the emancipated Jew still lives psychologically in an invisible Ghetto, and this prevents him shewing himself as he really is.

“ Even we, who are very ready to condemn other nations for their treatment of the Jews, do we not in our social circles raise up barriers against them ? Do we not start life with certain prejudices against the Jews ? Literature gives us a Shylock, portrayed in a masterful way, and we class many Jews in the same category. . . . When we speak of the crucified Christ we are apt to blame the whole Jewish race, just as to-day 600,000 Jews in Germany are living in a state of fear and distress because there is a policy of indiscriminate suppression on account of the evils wrought by a small proportion of the Jewish race. Are we surprised that the Jews think little of our Christianity when the Christian Church has so often shewn them vengeance, hatred, malice, and uncharitableness instead of the bright light of Christian charity ? ”



NOTE 5. See p. 185

*Concerning Beliar*

In the Ethiopic *Asc. Isa.* 2<sup>4</sup>, Beliar is called Maṭanbūchūs, 5<sup>3</sup>, "in Mēchēmbēcus." Neither the Greek nor the Latin has been preserved. As in the story of the martyrdom, Beliar speaks out of the mouth of Balchira (the false prophet), but was previously (3<sup>11</sup>) "in the heart of Manasse," Burkitt regards this as *metempsychosis*. See *op. cit.* pp. 47, 74. The whole question concerning Beliar is dealt with by Bousset in *Der Antichrist* (1895).

NOTE 6. See p. 187

*The Odes of Solomon*

The long-lost *Odes of Solomon*, written not before the close of the first century A.D., were published by Dr. Rendel Harris in 1909 from a Syriac MS. They are later than the Psalms of Solomon, with which they have nothing in common except that both purport to have been the work of the "wise" king. Whether the original language of the Odes was Semitic or Greek is a disputed point. According to Harnack, the Odes were originally Hebrew and subjected to Christian interpolations at a later date. Harris argues for a Greek original. Since the author does not take the Pauline view either with regard to the sacrificial aspect of Christ's death or with regard to His resurrection, some reckon him to have been a Johannine Christian. The Odes exhibit no mean poetical talent, and reflect the outlook of later Judaism. Dr. Harris (Harris and Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, p. 197) views them as mystical private poems, without sacramental reference, while, according to Bishop Ossory (*Texts and Studies*, vol. viii. p. 42), they are probably liturgical hymns for the use either of catechumens or of the recently baptized. See further, *The Doctrine of Immortality in the Odes of Solomon*, by Rendel Harris.

NOTE 7. See p. 173

*The Name Jesus*

In an essay on the Name Jesus, contributed to the series of Christological studies, entitled *Mysterium Christi*, Adolf Deissmann rejects the theory of the American scholar, William Benjamin Smith, that the doctrine concerning Jesus was really of pre-Christian origin. As summarized by Deissmann, this theory is to the effect that the name Jesus "originally denoted, not an earthly human personality, but a divinity, and originated in the Diaspora. It was associated with the ancient Jewish divine name *Christ*, and in the combination *Jesus Christ* the essence of Early Christianity is contained and expressed." The learned Professor holds that there is no evidence of the name Jesus having been used as a cult-name before the Christian era; that it frequently occurred in the Diaspora in the Græcized form Jeshua (=Jason); that the Jesus-inscription recently discovered among others at the ancient Leontopolis in Egypt is merely commemorative of an otherwise unknown Jew, and has no reference to the hero of a cult; that from being in use as an ordinary personal name "*Jesus* first became a cult-name when Jesus of Nazareth, after His exaltation, was given divine reverence as the *kyrios*, that is, after the rise of the cult of Jesus Christ in the Early Church"; that subsequently, both among Jews and Christians, it soon ceased to be in vogue as a personal name, for reasons of hatred on the one hand, and of reverence on the other; and that in the text of the NT wherever it is used of other persons than the Saviour the name has been more or less successfully camouflaged or even obliterated (e.g. Lk 3<sup>29</sup>; Ac 7<sup>45</sup>; Col 4<sup>11</sup>; Mt 27<sup>16f.</sup>). Origen states (in his commentary on Matthew) that in "very old" manuscripts Barabbas was also called Jesus, so that Pilate's question to the Jews may have taken the pointed form: "Do you wish me to release Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus Christ?" Thus "from the gloomy subordinate figure of Jesus Barabbas a sufficient ray of light falls on the historical reality of Jesus Christ and his martyrdom." Deissmann is further of

opinion that in Mk 15<sup>7</sup> "Jesus called Barabbas" was the earliest form of the text, and that in Philemon 23 f. the name "Jesus Justus" (cf. Col. 4<sup>11</sup>) has been significantly removed.

On the main question his conclusion is that there was no "retrograde movement from an alleged primary cult-name to a secondary and unhistorical personal name. The path of history leads from a historical personal name to a cult-name, from the gospel of Jesus of Nazareth to the cult of Jesus Christ the Lord."

NOTE 8. See p. 275

### *Contents of the Zend-Avesta*

1. The Vendidad, the book of "the anti-demonic laws," purports to give the report of an alleged dialogue between Ormazd and Zoroaster. Its twenty-two chapters are largely devoted to the religious aspect of agriculture, the sacred elements (fire, water, etc.), bodily purifications, the care of animals, etc.—all in direct relation to the ceaseless war against the forces of evil. With it are incorporated two larger liturgical works, namely, the Yasna and the Vispered.

2. The Yasna comprises the liturgical or sacrificial service in seventy-two fargards or sections. (a) The first part (1–27) is made up mostly of invocations and adoration of Ormazd, to whom the whole creation is ascribed. (b) The second part (28–54) contains the Gāthās, a metrical presentation of the prophet's discourses and exhortations. (c) The later Yasna consists of a collection of invocations.

3. The Vispered, similar in character to the Yasna, contains twenty-four short chapters. Its name (= "all the chiefs, *i.e.* of the spiritual aristocracy) implies its dedication to the objects of purity hailed by the Zoroastrians. The first section is composed of invocations to Ormazd.

4. The Khurdah-Avesta, or minor liturgy, for the use of all adherents of the faith.

5. The Yashts ("songs of praise"), twenty-one in number,

are invocations of separate Izads. Some of them are closely akin to the Rig-Veda hymns, and form a fruitful body of legendary lore.

(The Bundahish, it may be added, is a later digest of Zoroastrian cosmogonies and doctrines.)

#### NOTE 9. See p. 352

##### *Origen's View concerning the Resurrection-body*

According to Paul the resurrection-body will be fashioned like the glorified body of Christ (1 Co 15<sup>48f.</sup>; Ph 3<sup>21</sup>). Already in the third century of our era, Origen founding upon this promise, held that the resurrection-body will be an ethereal body, but the apostle's statement, namely, that it will be a pneumatic or spiritual body, in which the ruling element is spirit (*πνεῦμα*) in contrast to soul (*ψυχή*), of which the organ is the earthly body, must not be unduly stretched. "The doctrine of the resurrection of the body Origen accepted as an integral part of the Church's creed, and even defended it in opposition to heretics. What made it possible for him to take up this position—that he had difficulties about the ecclesiastical doctrine is evident from *Contra Cels.* v. 14 ff.—was the language used by Paul regarding a spiritual body. This enabled him to get rid of his doubts, and to take refuge in certain characteristic refinements upon the apostle's words. In this way he was led to hold that at the resurrection we shall be clothed a second time with the body that we now inhabit. It will be the same, but with a difference. Owing to a change in its material substance, it will be spiritual, glorious, incorruptible. By the power and grace of the resurrection there will be educed from the animal body a *spiritual* body devoid of all material attributes, and even of members with sensuous functions, a body resplendent as the stars of heaven. This is possible, because in the substance of the body there is an indestructible germ which raises it up and restores it, as the germinative principle in the grain of wheat which dies in the ground restores the grain into a body having stalk and ear. The Will of God

who made it what it is, can raise this present body of ours to the purity and splendour of a spiritual body "according as the condition of things requires, and the deserts of our rational nature shall demand." The difference in the degree of glory among those who rise again is explained by the fact that the soul's new tenement is conditioned by its worth. In every case the general features will be preserved, and the body suited to its new environment."—"Origen," in *World's Epoch-Makers*, p. 208.

# INDEX

- Achæmenidæ, 273, 278, 280.  
 Acra, 12, 81.  
 Acre, Bay of, 24 f.  
 Actium, Battle of, 25, 42.  
 Acts of the Apostles, 44, 57, 67, 74, 270, 281.  
 Adam, J., 206, 215, 226.  
 Adasa, 12.  
 Advent of Christ, 29, 31, 316.  
 Advent, Second, 167, 303, 350, 359, 363.  
 Ænesidemus of Cnossus, 247.  
 Æschylus, 7, 207 ff.  
 Agrippa I., 35, 44, 54 ff., 68.  
 Agrippa II., 57, 60, 63 f., 81, 385 f.  
 Ahriman, 276 ff.  
 Albinus, 62 f.  
 Alexander the Great, 1, 8, 23 ff., 38, 40, 140, 263, 268, 301, 303.  
 Alexander, son of Aristobulus, 37.  
 Alexander, son of Herod, 44, 55.  
 Alexander, brother of Philo, 146.  
 Alexandra, wife of Jannæus, 13 f., 36, 86, 113, 127.  
 Alexandria, 7, 9, 50, 53, 55, 66, 93, 144 f., 248, 250, 263, 312.  
 Alexandrian Judaism, 282, 285.  
 Amenophis II., III., and IV., 82.  
 Amesha Spentas, 276, 370.  
 Amusements, Roman craze for, 33 ff.  
 Ananias, high-priest, 64.  
 Ananus, 67.  
 Ancyra monument, 31.  
 Andrews, 183.  
 Angelology, 173, 281 f.  
 Angus, 259, 266 f., 269, 273.  
 Antichrist, 185, 282.  
 Antigonus, 28, 40 f., 80 f., 120.  
 Antioch, 49, 65 f., 143, 145, 152, 342, 345.  
 Antiochus of Ascalon, 248.  
 Antiochus III., the Great, 9, 144.  
 Antiochus IV., Epiphanes, 10, 22, 126, 140, 150, 168.  
 Antiochus VII., Sidetes, 12 f.  
 Antipas, son of Herod, 47 f., 55 f.  
 Antipater, 34, 38 ff.  
 Antipater, son of Herod, 45 ff.  
 Antisthenes, 237, 239.  
 Antonia, castle of, 63 f., 69, 81.  
 Antony, 25, 39 ff., 129.  
 Apocalyptic, 165 ff., 188 ff., 285.  
 Apocrypha, 100, 127, 159 ff., 370.  
 Apuleius, 264 f.  
 Aratus of Soli, 193.  
 Arcesilaus of Pitane, 247.  
 Archelaus, 41, 47, 50, 53, 89, 120.  
 Archilaus, 44 f.  
 Aretas, 36, 48, 53.  
 Aristæas, letter of, 141.  
 Aristides, 260.  
 Aristobulus, son of Hyrcanus, 13, 36 f., 84, 152.  
 Aristobulus II., 13 f.  
 Aristophanes, 213 f., 261.  
 Aristotle, 230 ff.  
 Arnold, Matthew, 290, 302.  
 Arnon, 77.  
 Artaxerxes I., 273.  
 Ascension of Isaiah, 163, 170, 178 f., 184 f.  
 Asmodæus, 282.  
 Assumption of Moses, 130, 135, 137, 163, 170, 181, 283, 363.  
 Astrology, 268 f.  
 Athens, 7, 30 f., 142, 144, 212 ff., 231, 237, 243, 259, 261.  
 Athlit, 82.  
 Athronges, 49.  
 Attis, 261 f.  
 Augustan Age, 21.  
 Augustus Caesar, 20 ff., 34, 38, 44 f., 48 f., 58, 105, 196.  
 Aurelius, Marcus, 244.  
 Azazel, 172, 190, 282.  
 Bacchides, 12.  
 Bacchylides, 204 f.  
 Barth, Karl, 302.  
 Bartoli, 197.

- Baruch, Apocalypse of, 131,  
     135 ff., 163, 181 ff., 283,  
     285 f., 311.  
 Barzaphernes, 40.  
 Beliar, 185 f., 282, 388.  
 Berenice, 44, 63 f.  
 Bertholet, 141, 149.  
 Berytus, 35, 57.  
 Beth-horon, 65.  
 Bevan, E., 241, 243, 259, 271,  
     369 f.  
 Beyschlag, 158, 318 f., 323, 329,  
     355, 361, 365.  
 Bezetha, 65, 81.  
 Bigg, Charles, 194.  
 Blackie, J. S., 6.  
 Boissier, 260.  
 Bolshevism, 314 f.  
 Bousset, 119, 127, 185, 302.  
 Browning, 211.  
 Brutus, 39.  
 Buchan, John, 90.  
 Büchler, Adolf, 89.  
 Buck, Pearl S., 335 f.  
 Burke, Edmund J., 7.  
 Burkitt, 163, 169, 171, 181.  
  
 Cæcilius Rufus, 35.  
 Cæsarea, 43, 47, 57, 62, 68, 74,  
     80.  
 Caiaphas, 53.  
 Caird, E., 234.  
 Caligula, 48, 53 ff., 145, 384.  
 Candlish, J. S., 372.  
 Carlyle, Thomas, 348.  
 Carneades of Cyrene, 247.  
 Cassius, 39.  
 Cato, 16, 30, 255.  
 Cerinthus, 377.  
 Charles, R. H., 129, 131, 138, 163,  
     171, 175, 177, 179, 182.  
 Cheetham, Canon, 290.  
 Cheyne, 274, 280, 287, 289.  
 Chisholm, R. F., 387.  
 Christ, the Fact of, 316 ff.  
 Christianity, 167 f., 173, 206, 228,  
     242, 270 f., 280, 290 ff., 298,  
     302 f., 313 ff., 335 f., 345, 364.  
 Chrysippus of Soli, 237, 240.  
 Cicero, 35, 217, 248, 256 f.  
 Claudius, 35, 55, 57, 60, 196.  
 Cleanthes of Soli, 193, 237.  
 Clement, 181, 188, 260.  
 Cleopatra, 41 f., 129.  
 Cœle-Syria, 9, 142.  
 Communism, as represented by  
     Russian Soviet, 315.  
 Confucius, 316.  
 Coriolanus, 16.  
 Costobar, 43.  
 Crassus, 38.  
 Cumont, 265.  
 Curtius, Q., 274.  
 Cybele-Attis Cult, 261 f.  
 Cynics, 237, 244.  
 Cypros, 55.  
 Cyprus, 21, 83, 143, 172, 238.  
  
 Daëvas, 276, 278 f.  
 Damascus, 36, 55, 77 f., 144, 152,  
     325 f., 331.  
 Daniel, Book of, 281, 283.  
 Dante, 230, 250.  
 Darius I., 273 f.  
 Davidson, A. B., 162, 310, 366,  
     370, 378 f.  
 Dead Sea, 75, 77 f.  
 Deane, 163.  
 Decapolis, 76 f., 84.  
 Deissmann, A., 389 f.  
 Delitzsch, 93.  
 Demetrius II., 12.  
 Democritus, 244 f.  
 Demonology, 282 f.  
 Denney, 331, 367.  
 Deuteronomy, 107, 124, 309.  
 Dillmann, 127, 183.  
 Dindorf, 260.  
 Diodorus, 243.  
 Diogenes, 237.  
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 32.  
 Dispersion of the Jews, 99, 140 ff.,  
     280 f., 352.  
 Dods, 379.  
 Döllinger, 7.  
 Domitian, 183.  
 Dora, 56.  
 Doyle, Sir A. Conan, 352.  
 Drummond, 163, 188.  
 Drusilla, 61.  
  
 Ecclesiasticus, 92, 99, 159.  
 Edrei, 77.  
 Egypt, religion of, 316.  
 Egyptian State archives and  
     officials, 82.  
 Egyptian workshops, 257.  
 Ekron, 77.  
 Elasa, 12.  
 Eleasar, 61, 64 f., 68, 121.  
 Eleusinian Mysteries, 259 f., 267.  
 Engedi, 118.  
 Ennius, 256.

- Enoch, Book of, 127, 129, 135, 163, 172 ff., 188, 283, 311, 321 f., 363.  
 Enoch 2 (Slavonic Enoch), 163, 178 ff.  
 Ephesus, 145, 196, 380.  
 Epictetus, 244 ff.  
 Epimenides, 193 f.  
 Epistles (NT), 158 ff., 189 ff., 316, 321, 328 ff.  
 Epistles, Hellenic influence upon, 194 f.  
 Epistles, Roman element in, 196 f.  
 Erman, 263.  
 Eschatology, Jewish, 283 ff.  
 Esdraelon, 74 f.  
 Essenes, 103, 117 ff., 270, 282, 284 f., 287.  
 Ethnarch, 37 f., 50, 89.  
 Euclides of Megara, 243.  
 Euripides, 7, 213 ff.  
 Eurycles, 45.  
 Ezekiel, 286, 309.  
 Ezra 2 (4), 132 ff., 138 f., 181 ff., 283, 285, 311.  
  
 Fadus, 58 f.  
 Felix, 60 ff.  
 Festus, 62.  
 Firmicus Maternus, 262.  
 Flaccus, 55.  
 Florus, Gessius, 63, 121.  
 Foucart, 260.  
 Fowler, W. Warde, 33.  
 Franks, R. S., 308, 313.  
 Frazer, J. G., 263.  
 Frederick II., 301.  
 Friedländer, 27.  
 Fritzsche and Grimm, 159.  
  
 Gabinius, 37 ff., 79, 89.  
 Galba, 68, 78 f.  
 Galilee, 47, 49, 55, 66, 78 f., 84.  
 Galilee, Sea of, 75, 78.  
 Gallus, Cestius, 64, 66.  
 Gathās, 275 ff.  
 Gaza, 50, 74.  
 Gehenna, 284.  
 Geldner, 276.  
 Gerasa, 77.  
 Gerousia, 88 f.  
 Gesenius, 96, 288.  
 Gezer, 81.  
 Gibbon, 279.  
 Glover, T. R., 328.  
 Gnosticism, 266.  
 Goldsmith, 253.  
  
 Gospel, the Christian, 168, 277, 290 f., 303 f., 328 f.  
 Graetz, 188.  
 Grant, Sir A., 233.  
 Greek element in NT Epistles, 193 ff., 313.  
 Greek language in Palestine, 86 ff.  
 Gregg, 161 f.  
 Grote, 201.  
  
 Habērim, 76, 108, 112.  
 Hades, 166, 211, 269, 322.  
 Hadrian, 16.  
 Haifa, 74, 82.  
 Halachah, 109.  
 Haoma, cult of, 274.  
 Harris, Rendel, 194, 388.  
 Harrison, J. E., 8.  
 Hasidim, 12, 113.  
 Hasmonaeans, 36, 41, 43 ff., 105, 112, 128, 133, 169.  
 Hauran, 76.  
 Hausrath, 87, 109, 113.  
 Hebrews, Epistle to the, 180, 183, 313, 322 f., 329, 332 f., 364 ff., 378 f.  
 Heine, 292.  
 Henry of Navarre, 57.  
 Heraclitus, 194, 216, 242.  
 Herford, R. T., 114, 343.  
 Hermetic Mystery Books, 265 f.  
 Herod the Great, 38, 41 ff., 55, 74, 79 f., 81, 88 f., 97 ff.  
 Herodias, 47 f., 55.  
 Herodium, 71.  
 Herodotus, 20.  
 Herrmann, 333 f., 334, 349.  
 Hesiod, 203 f.  
 Hilgenfeld, 163.  
 Hippias of Elis, 213.  
 Homer, 201 ff.  
 Horace, 16, 152.  
 Hyrcanus, John, 13, 37, 79, 87, 112, 127 f., 152, 169, 177.  
 Hyrcanus II., 13, 37 ff., 89.  
  
 Idumea, 67, 152.  
 Incarnation, the, 170, 296, 317, 329 f., 333, 336.  
 Inge, W. R., 251, 316.  
 Isis, the Egyptian, 257, 262 ff.  
 Isocrates, 213.  
 Italy, 55, 131, 145.  
 Ituræa, 13, 26, 152.  
 Izates, 152.



- Jabbok, 76 f.  
 James, 56, 326.  
 James, Epistle of, 34, 154, 160 f., 337, 359 ff.  
 Jamnia, 54.  
 Jannæus, Alexander, 13, 36, 112, 147, 151.  
 Jeremiah, 134, 144, 293, 309.  
 Jericho, 36, 42, 46, 50, 73, 75, 80, 82, 89, 91.  
 Jerome, 174.  
 Jerusalem, 9 ff., 13, 36 ff., 43 f., 48 f., 56 ff., 65 ff., 80 ff., 85 ff., 89, 91, 95, 101, 121, 146 ff.  
 Jesus, 23, 47, 49, 76, 79, 88, 94 f., 103 f., 112, 114 f., 131, 134, 166 f., 227, 229, 267, 270, 272, 291, 298, 302, 325 ff., 383, 389 f.  
 Jewish War with Rome, 64 ff.  
 Jews, spiritual and moral influence of, 301, 303 f.  
 Joarib, 105.  
 Joazar, 50.  
 John, the Apostle, 88, 326, 337.  
 John, First Epistle of, 172 f., 331, 354 ff., 375 ff.  
 John the Baptist, 27, 47, 77, 80, 96, 134, 272.  
 John of Giscala, 51, 65 ff., 121.  
 Jonathan, High-priest, 61.  
 Jonathan, the Maccabee, 12, 143.  
 Joppa, 74.  
 Jordan, 72, 77, 82.  
 Jordan, Valley of the, 75.  
 Josephus, 8, 57, 65 ff., 84, 86, 89, 92, 110, 113, 115, 118 f., 121, 131, 140 ff., 149, 152, 282, 284, 287.  
 Jost, 164.  
 Jotapata, 66.  
 Jubilees, Book of, 109, 128, 177 f., 281, 283.  
 Judæa, 36 f., 48, 51, 55, 57, 64, 70, 80, 83, 87, 383 f.  
 Judaism, 9, 122 ff., 148 f., 254, 258, 288 f., 292, 296, 298, 300 ff., 311, 316, 328, 370.  
 Judaism, pre-exilic, 160, 280.  
 Judas of Gamala, 51.  
 Judas Maccabæus, 11 f., 83, 127, 143, 169.  
 Judas, Rabbi, 46, 48.  
 Jude, Epistle of, 166, 171 f., 362.  
 Julius Cæsar, 19, 39, 301.  
 Justin Martyr, 29, 214.  
 Juvenal, 29, 34, 152, 264, 273.  
 Kautzsch, 159, 163, 177.  
 Keats, 6.  
 Kennedy, 251, 260, 262, 264 f., 319, 373.  
 Kittel, 333, 335.  
 Lees, G. R., 101.  
 Lejá, 76.  
 Leontopolis, 147.  
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 197.  
 Lightfoot, John, 90, 282, 381.  
 Livy, 252 f.  
 Lodge, Sir Oliver, 352.  
 Lods, 363.  
 Lucian of Samosata, 247.  
 Lünemann, 162.  
 Lydda, 74.  
 Lysanias, 56.  
 Lysias, Syrian Viceroy, 11.  
 Maccabees, 11, 14, 22, 84, 87, 89, 111, 125 ff., 145, 298, 300.  
 Macgregor, W. M., 343.  
 Machærus, 71, 77.  
 Mackintosh, H. R., 323.  
 Magdala, 91.  
 Magians, 273, 278.  
 Magic and the Mysteries, 270.  
 Malchus, 42.  
 Malichus, 39.  
 Manahem, 64.  
 Marcellus, 52.  
 Mariamme, 40 ff., 44 ff.  
 Maritime Plain, 74.  
 Martin, 329 f.  
 Masâda, 71, 122.  
 Mattathias, father of the Maccabees, 11 f., 121.  
 Mattathias, Rabbi, 46, 48.  
 Messiah, 126 ff., 158, 188, 190, 353, 369, 375.  
 Messianic Hope, 125 ff., 287, 289, 300, 311 f.  
 Mesusah, 94, 124.  
 Meyer, 174, 327.  
 Mill, John Stuart, 221.  
 Milligan, 138.  
 Minucius Felix, 264.  
 M. shnah, 95, 114, 123.  
 Mithra, 276 f.  
 Mithras-worship, 272.  
 Moffatt, 136, 158, 341, 375, 377.  
 Moore, G. F., 185.  
 Morgan, 319, 373.  
 Moriah, Mount, 81.  
 Muirhead, 86.  
 Murray, Gilbert, 202, 213.

- Musonius, 244.  
 Mystery Religions, 258 ff., 290, 333, 341.  
 Nabatæans, 36.  
 Nazareth, 78, 89.  
 Neapolis (Shechem), 79.  
 Nebuchadrezzar, 83, 131.  
 Neoplatonists, 250.  
 Neo-Pythagoreans, 248.  
 Nero, 58, 66, 78, 185 f.  
 Nicanor, 12.  
 Nicanor's Day, 12.  
 Nicolas, 290.  
 Octavian, 25, 39 f., 42.  
 Oehler, 103.  
 Olympian deities, 15.  
 Olympian theology, 201.  
 Ophel, Mount, 81.  
 Oriental cults, 257.  
 Origen, 23, 174, 181, 391.  
 Ormazd, 276 ff.  
 Orphism, 205 f., 267 ff.  
 Osborn, 5.  
 Otho, 68.  
 Pacorus, 40.  
 Pāhlavi literature, 274.  
 Palestine, 8 f., 18, 55, 72 ff., 82, 84, 87, 93 f., 104.  
 Palestine, Central Range of, 74 f.  
 Panætius of Rhodes, 243.  
 Papias, 9, 47, 75.  
 Paradise, Essene idea of, 284.  
 Parthians, 15, 40, 48.  
 Parsis, sacred books of the, 275 f.  
 Paterson, W. P., 337.  
 Paul, 85, 88, 92 ff., 114, 120, 122, 152 f., 157 f., 161, 173, 179, 183 ff., 189 ff., 196 f., 234, 237, 243, 304, 312 f., 316 ff., 325 ff., 336 ff., 361 f., 372 ff., 379 f.  
 Peake, 293.  
 Peraea, 47, 55, 72, 76, 77.  
 Peter, 56, 88, 153 f., 326, 334, 336, 342 f.  
 Peter, First Epistle of, 153 f., 328, 331 f., 352 ff., 375.  
 Peter, Second Epistle of, 363.  
 Petrie, Flinders, 82, 147.  
 Petronius, 32, 54, 60, 113, 252.  
 Pfeiderer, 221, 226, 230, 234, 251.  
 Pharisees, 13, 43, 51, 56, 86, 111 ff., 152, 285, 297, 311 f.  
 Phasael, 38 f.  
 Pheroras 46.  
 Philæ, 262.  
 Philip, son of Herod, 47 f., 56.  
 Philo, 53, 59, 110, 118 f., 130 f., 133, 136 f., 144, 146, 152, 162, 248 ff., 313, 319 f., 369.  
 Phœnicia, 9, 41.  
 Phœnicians, 74, 78, 92, 142.  
 Pilate, Pontius, 47, 51 ff., 58, 85, 88, 325, 333, 384.  
 Pindar, 206 f.  
 Plato, 152, 221 ff., 272, 303.  
 Plautus, 256.  
 Pliny, 275.  
 Plotinus, 250 f., 316.  
 Plumptre, 361.  
 Plutarch, 29, 262, 275, 287.  
 Polybius, 254.  
 Pompey, 36 ff., 145, 163.  
 Poppæa, 63.  
 Posidonius, 243.  
 Presbyterion, 88.  
 Pre-Socratic Natural Philosophy, 216.  
 Priestly Code, 309.  
 Procurators, Roman, 51 ff., 57 ff.  
 Prodicus of Ceos, 213.  
 Prophets of Israel, 292 ff.  
 Protagoras, 212 f.  
 Proverbs, 31 ff., 99, 298.  
 Quadratus, 60 f.  
 Quirinius, 50.  
 Rabbinism, 168.  
 Reitzenstein, 265.  
 Reland, 282.  
 Resurrection, doctrine of the, 191 f., 285, 311 f., 330 ff., 351 f.  
 Reuss, 183.  
 Rhodes, 7, 42.  
 Roman Civil War, 49.  
 Roman Empire, 18 f., 23 f., 27, 43, 145.  
 Roman Law, 27.  
 Roman Religion, 251 ff.  
 Roman Satirists, 152.  
 Roman slave population, 31 f.  
 Rome, 18 f., 24, 26, 31 f., 34, 37 ff., 44, 48, 54 f., 60, 145, 254.  
 Rose, J. D., 73.  
 Rostootzeff, 34.  
 Ruth, Book of, 153, 298.  
 Sabinus, 48 f.  
 Sadducees, 13, 114, 282, 286.

- Saddukos, 113.  
 Salome, Alexandra, sister of Herod, 42, 44 f.  
 Samaria, 55, 57, 60, 79 f., 91.  
 Samaria, City of, 91 f.  
 Samaritans, 52, 60 f., 63, 79, 83, 86 ff.  
 Samuel, 83.  
 Sanday and Headlam, 161, 197.  
 Sanhedrin, 39, 61, 63, 65, 79, 86 ff., 106, 384.  
 Saoshyant, 278.  
 Sardinia, 31.  
 Sassanid kings, 278.  
 Satan, 179, 189 f., 282 f., 288.  
 Scaurus, 34, 36.  
 Sceptics, the, 247.  
 Schechter, 257.  
 Schleusner, 282.  
 Schürer, 84, 87, 123 f., 127, 130, 140, 142, 146, 159, 163, 183.  
 Schweitzer, 167 f., 192, 327, 386 f.  
 Segan, Captain of Temple, 106.  
 Seleucid Era, 12.  
 Seleucidæ, 8 ff., 145.  
 Seneca, 29, 244, 301.  
 Sepphoris, 38, 49, 66, 78.  
 Septuagint, 9, 141, 157, 159.  
 Serapeum, 9, 263.  
 Serapis, 257, 263.  
 "Servant" of Jahweh, 310.  
 Shakespeare, 376.  
 Shammai, 39.  
 Shema', 109 f.  
 Sheol, 284, 286.  
 Shephelah, 74.  
 Sibylline, Oracles, 127 ff., 133 ff., 137, 163, 185 ff.  
 Sicarii, 51, 58, 61 f., 71, 121, 140.  
 Simon ben Giora, 67 ff., 121.  
 Simon the Maccabee, 12 f., 105, 143, 169.  
 Sin, the Fact of, 307 ff.  
 Sin and Salvation, ideas of, 308 ff.  
 Skinner, J., 310, 370.  
 Slavery, prevalence of, 30 ff.  
 Smith, Sir G. A., 76, 81.  
 Socrates, 212, 216 ff., 301.  
 Söderblom, 221, 280.  
 Soemus, 42.  
 Sopatros, 272.  
 Sophists, 211 ff.  
 Sophocles, 210 f.  
 Sosius, 40.  
 Spirit, the Fact of the, 368 ff.  
 Stapfer, 95 f., 298.  
 Stewardship, Christian, 349 f.  
 Stilpo, 243.  
 Stoics, 29, 237 ff., 272, 320.  
 Suetonius, 300.  
 Synagogue, 53, 107 ff., 148.  
 Synedrion, 86, 88 f.  
 Syrian sun-god, worship of, in Rome, 257.  
 Tacitus, 25, 29, 31, 62, 152, 300.  
 Talmud, 109, 113.  
 Talmudists, 92.  
 Tarichæa, 78, 91.  
 Tell-el-Amarna, 81 f.  
 Tell Fara, 82.  
 Temple, the, 9 ff., 37, 43, 54, 56, 59, 69 f., 81, 93, 101, 105 ff., 146 ff., 296, 384.  
 Temple Mount, 37, 63, 65, 67, 69, 87.  
 Temple worship, 148.  
 Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 163, 169 f., 175 ff., 184.  
 Theognis, 204.  
 Theopompus, 287.  
 Theudas, 58, 62.  
 Thutmosis III., 82.  
 Tiberias, 34, 47, 55 f., 58.  
 Tiberius Cæsar, 47, 55 f., 196.  
 Tibullus, 254.  
 Tiglath-Pileser, 83.  
 Timon of Phlius, 247.  
 Titus, 35, 66, 68 ff.  
 Tobit, Book of, 159, 281, 297.  
 Torah, 70, 107 ff., 114.  
 Trachonitis, 76 f.  
 Transjordania, 74, 76, 92.  
 Trench, 125.  
 Tryphon, general of Antiochus, 12.  
 Tryphon, brother of Osiris, 262.  
 Varus, Governor of Syria, 49, 78, 99.  
 Vendidad, 278.  
 Ventidius Cumanus, 59 f.  
 Vergil, 258, 300.  
 Vespasian, 66, 68.  
 Vishtëspa, 274 f.  
 Vitellius, Legate of Syria, 52 f., 68.  
 Warfield, 336.  
 Weizsäcker, 318.  
 Wernle, 295.  
 Wesley, Charles, 342.  
 Wette, de, 125 f.  
 Wilcken, 263.  
 Willrich, 140 ff.

Winer, 282.  
Wisdom, Book of, 160 f., 321.  
Wordsworth, 16, 26.

Xenophon, 220.  
Xenophanes, 216.

Yarmuk, 76.  
Yasna, 276, 278.

Zama, battle of, 18.

Zealots, 50 ff., 58 f., 64, 66 f.,  
121 f., 130, 311.  
Zend Avesta, 274 ff., 289, 390.  
Zeno, 237 f., 240, 243, 275 ff.  
Zielinski, 265.  
Zion, Mount, 52, 81, 147.  
Zoroaster, 272 ff., 303, 390.  
Zoroastrianism, influence of, on  
OT religion and post-canon-  
ical Jewish writings, 280 ff.,  
370.

PRINTED BY  
MORRISON AND GIBB LTD.  
EDINBURGH AND LONDON



BS  
3635  
.F2

1128608

Fairweather

The background of  
the ~~gospels.~~ *epistles.*

JUN 1 1943  
JUN 12 '43

C. Kaug

7 arace #

AUG 4 '43

W. O. G. Fellow

Ad Gross

James Cobb

W. O. G. Fellow

8-10-43

DEC 27 1944

J. H. G. -

W. O. G. Fellow

W. J. Graham (rs)

FEB 6 1949

B. E. Armstrong

APR 25 1952

T. Stanley

APR 1 1950

APR 16 1954

C. E. Demaray

MAY 6 1957

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



42 394 414

1  
PS

3034

12

1128608

SWIFT HALL LIBR



UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



42 394 414

3